DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 129 EA 001 744

National Conference on School Finance (9th, Chicago, Illinois, April 3-5, 1966), Proceedings: Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance.

National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 66

Note- 164p.

Available from-National Education Assn., 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($3.00).

EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-Action Programs (Community), Dual Enrollment, *Educational Finance, Federal Aid, *Federal Government, Government Role, Higher Education, *Program Coordination, Public Schools, *School Districts, School Support, State Departments of Education, *State Government, State Legislation, Student Costs, Teacher Associations, Veterans Education, Vocational Education

This report consists of 24 papers dealing with local-State-Federal partnerships in school finance. Primary focus is on the development of techniques to ease critical areas of the intergovernmental relationship. Topics covered include (1) coordination of the school support programs of the three governmental levels, (2) development of specific programs stimulated by new Federal legislation and funds, (3) research in the theory of an techniques for working with State and local legislative bodies, and (4) modernization of school finance programs. (TT)

ED0 24129

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

LOCAL ★ STATE ★ FEDERAL

Partnership in School Finance

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★

EA 001 744

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES. MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION ONLY.

LOCAL ★ STATE ★ FEDERAL

Partnership in School Finance

The Proceedings of the Ninth
National Conference on School Finance
April 3-5, 1966
Chicago, Illinois

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Sponsored by the
Committee on Educational Finance
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, Northwest
Washington, D.C. 20036

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office to Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

NEA Committee on Educational Finance, 1965-66

BURLEY V. BECHDOLT, Chairman
Director of Research, Indiana State Teachers Association, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

WILLIAM D. FIRMAN
Director, Division of Evaluation, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201

ALLEN C. HARMAN
Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Norristown, Pennsylvania 19404

JOHN P. HINDMAN
Classroom Teacher, 1128 Walnut Drive, Casa Grande, Arizona 85222

ROBERT G. LINDSEY, JR.
Superintendent, Brooke County Schools, Wellsburg, West Virginia 26070

National Education Association, 1965-66

RICHARD D. BATCHELDER, President

WILLIAM G. CARR, Executive Secretary

SAM M. LAMBERT, Assistant Executive Secretary for Information Services

HAZEL DAVIS, Director of Research Division

JEAN M. FLANIGAN, Assistant Director of Research Division and Staff Contact for the Committee on Educational Finance

BEATRICE C. LEE, Publications Editor of Research Division

Copyright © 1966 by the
National Education Association
All Rights Reserved
$3.00 a copy

Contents

Foreword, *Burley V. Bechdolt* 5

Greetings from the National Education Association, *Sam M. Lambert* 7

The Essentials of a Modern School Finance Program, *Arthur F. Corey* 11

The Outlook for State and Local Governments, *Selma J. Mushkin* 19

The Compact for Education, *Ronald D. Moskowitz* 27

Promoting a Better Understanding of Education, *Loyd L. Turner* 33

State Action for Increased School Support

- Role of the State Department, *William D. Firman* 39
- Role of the State Education Association, *Elmer S. Crowley* 43
- Role of the State Legislature, *Oliver Ocasek* 51

The Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance

- As Viewed by a Local Administrator, *Earl C. Funderburk* 54
- As Viewed by a State Administrator, *Ewald B. Nyquist* 60
- As Viewed by a Federal Administrator, *Norman Karsh* 69

Federal Financing of Student Costs in Higher Education, *M. M. Chambers* 76

Dual Enrollment, *Alfred W. Beattie* 86

Plans and Progress is Providing New Vocational-Technical Training Programs, *John L. Feirer* 94

A Report on Experience with the Technical College in Northern Virginia, *Barnard Joy* 102

The Cost of Compliance with the Spirit and Letter of Federal Programs, *Benjamin C. Willis* 104
Jarvis Barnes 107

The Impact of Federal Government

On Texas Junior Colleges, *James Reynolds* 111
On Junior Colleges in Florida, *James L. Wattenbarger* 118

A New Look for the State Department of Education—

New Hampshire, *Paul R. Fillion* 125
Illinois, *Ray Page* 133

The Role of the Public School in Organizing, Coordinating, and Financing Community Action Programs, *Lewis J. McGuiness* 137

Role of the Federal Government in School Finance Research, *William P. McLure* 145

Research Needs in School Finance 152

Roster of Participants 159

Foreword

THE ANNUAL NATIONAL Conference on School Finance is sponsored by the Committee on Educational Finance of the National Education Association to provide a forum for presentation and discussion of the current issues and problems in school finance. This report comprises the papers presented at the Ninth Annual Conference. The viewpoints expressed are the authors' own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Committee and the National Education Association.

This year's conference theme, Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance, focused on the development of techniques to ease critical areas of the partnership. Several papers dealt with the broad issue of coordinating the school support programs of the three levels of government. Some papers focused on the development of specific new programs stimulated by new federal legislation and funds. Others reflected the Committee's continuing interest in research in educational finance, in the theory and techniques for working with state and local legislative bodies, and in the modernization of the school finance program.

The more than 200 persons participating in the conference represented local school systems, state education departments, state legislatures, the U. S. Office of Education, professional associations, and university professors of school administration and finance. The Committee wishes to acknowledge the enthusiasm and interest these conferences have enjoyed from these leaders in school finance and administration throughout the years, and expresses its appreciation to the authors for the high quality of their papers.

The Committee also wishes to acknowledge the support of Sam M. Lambert, NEA Assistant Executive Secretary for Information Services, and Hazel Davis, NEA Director of the Research Division.

Appreciation is also extended to the NEA Research Division staff who organized the conference and prepared these proceedings for publication: Jean M. Flanigan, Assistant Director of the Research Division and Staff Contact to the Committee; Beatrice C. Lee, Publications Editor of the Research Division and the Committee on Educational Finance; Gwendolyn Hogan, Linda Shiroma, Elizabeth B. Hamilton, Secretaries; Valdeane Rice, Administrative Assistant, and Wally Anne Sliter, Chief of the Typing-Production Section.

Burley V. Bechdolt, Chairman
NEA Committee on Educational
Finance, 1965-66

Greetings from the National Education Association

Sam M. Lambert, Assistant Executive Secretary
for Information Services

IRVAMAE APPLEGATE, President-Elect of the National Education Association, was scheduled to open this year's conference, but she is ill and will not be with us. She asked me to extend her warmest greetings to all of you and to assure you of her support and appreciation for the work this group has done over the years.

This evening marks the beginning of the ninth of these annual conferences. When we planned the first one back in 1958, we were not certain there would ever be another one. We were uncertain that people would come, and we were even more uncertain that they would enjoy and profit from the program we had planned.

But we have already had eight of these meetings, and each one, I believe, has been a little better than its predecessor. I hope this Ninth National Conference on School Finance will not be an exception, because for the first time in all these years you or the organization you work for is paying all your travel and living costs. I am sorry the Committee on Educational Finance had to eliminate this financial assistance to official representatives from each state, but we were short of funds and we believed the time had come for the Conference to stand on its own feet. Apparently this financial aid is no longer necessary, because our advance registration is larger this year than ever before.

Last night I tried to list from memory just a few high lights of the Committee's work in recent years. Certainly this annual conference would be listed high in anyone's set of priorities. Through this annual meeting we have shared a wealth of experience with one another; persons working for national, state, and local governments have become acquainted with their counterparts in professional organizations throughout the United States, and this mix has been good for all of us; it has provided an effective instrumentality for corralling and sharing with all states some of the best talent in the country, not only from the field of education but also from economics, public finance, and government as well.

Two years ago the Committee tackled the ambitious task of preparing an annual report on the financial status of the public schools, and it met a need in the field of school finance. This annual project, in my opinion, is one of the most dramatic and useful

6/7

things we have ever done. The Committee, at present, is the only agency in the United States which tries to describe from a financial point of view where we have been in education, where we are at present, and where we seem to be headed. Each year we have enumerated some of the unfinished tasks and problems of education, and in some cases we have estimated the cost of getting done the job that ought to be done. At this conference we shall have a chance to see and evaluate the preliminary work on the third annual report on the financial status of the schools. As in the past, this third report will be completed and presented at the annual convention of the NEA this summer in Miami.

Another outstanding achievement in the Committee's program has been the consolidation of research and writing on the thesis that education is good business. Not only have we amassed a large collection of the best materials available, we have reinterpreted this information and disseminated it throughout the country. I think the Committee and its staff can claim an important share of the credit for the general acceptance, at least by well-informed persons, that schools and colleges are a high-dividend paying investment in America's economic growth. For those who are looking for information in this field, there is no better source than the files and publications of the Committee on Educational Finance.

The *CEF Report,* our periodic review of current developments in school finance, public finance, and economics, has helped all of us keep our knowledge and understanding up to date. The professors who attend this meeting tell me these reports have provided ideas and materials for many useful and stimulating lectures.

Several years ago we started our annual compilation of rates at which individual states levy taxes on income, alcoholic beverages, sales, and other items, a report which also includes total revenue derived from each of these sources. This information is brought up to date every year, and it has provided an invaluable tool to those involved in state tax legislation.

Within the last two years the Committee has collected and reported some extremely interesting information which has been helpful in trying to get people to understand the sheer size and importance of the education enterprise. I wonder if you know, for example, that approximately 8 percent of the civilian labor force is employed in the schools and colleges or in the construction or production of things used by schools and colleges. We also know that almost one-fourth of the total population of this country is now enrolled in a public elementary or secondary school. We are taking care of and teaching 42 million children and youth at approximately 50 cents per-pupil hour.

Of course, many other contributions of the Committee to the field of school finance could be mentioned, but time is short and I have to stop. If you wonder how this important Committee of the National Education Association can do so much on $40,000 per year, the secret is the staff of the NEA Research Division. This Division has always provided the staff work for the Committee, and in Jean Flanigan, assistant director of the Division, who directs the staff work, you have one of the most capable, hard-working persons in this business.

Now, let me say for Dr. Applegate and for myself, enjoy yourselves and have a good meeting. We hope this one will be better than last year's, but if it is not, write us and let us know so we can do better in 1967.

If you are not a member of the NEA, and I know a few of you are not, let me explain that the average cost per participant in these meetings over the years has been approximately $60. This $60 comes out of the pocket of a third-grade teacher in West Virginia, a high-school English teacher in Oregon, a kindergarten teacher in Utah, a junior high-school counselor in Florida, and perhaps a principal and a superintendent in some other state. NEA's proportional investment in your work has been far greater than it has been for other segments of the membership. If you have not paid your dues for this year, please do so as soon as possible, preferably before you leave this meeting. We now have 980,000 members of the NEA, and we are trying our best to make it 1,000,000 by convention time this summer.

The Essentials of a Modern School Finance Program

Arthur F. Corey

SCHOOL FINANCE in America in 1966 is in chaos. That is to say, it is in disorder and confusion. This crisis, for such it is, exists not because of our professional leadership in school finance, but in spite of it. Educational literature is full of prophetic warnings which have gone unheeded. In the opinion of many, the historical and imperative wall between public- and private-school finance has now been breached. The child who lives in New York still has nearly three times the amount of money available for his education as does the child who lives in Mississippi. The nation is speedily moving toward urbanization and in our big cities we already face the unenviable alternatives of educational or financial bankruptcy. Large scale federal aid is now a reality, and what happens in the immediate future will determine whether such aid will be more disruptive than helpful. The demands being made upon education are greater than ever before, and nowhere in America is school support really adequate. These are some of the interrelated elements which make up the present crisis.

In time of trouble there is always strong temptation to assume that ours is the third or fourth generation upon which the cumulative sins of the fathers are being visited. The whole history of public education in America has been one continuing struggle with recurring points of crisis.

Some of us can remember 1933. There were 15 million unemployed and these together with their dependents made up about one-third of the total population. Most teachers in America had taken a sizable and voluntary pay cut. Many schools were closed and thousands of teachers were teaching without pay. Worst of all, a paralyzing fear gripped the American people. In short, "things were bad all over."

The National Education Association and the Department of Superintendence, acting jointly, appointed a Joint Commission on the Emergency in Education, under the chairmanship of John K. Norton of Teachers College, Columbia University. Serving with him were J. B. Edmondson, Sidney B. Hall of Virginia, A. L. Threlkeld of Denver; Herbert S. Weet of Rochester, and David Weglein of Baltimore. The reports of the activities of this Commission, appearing in the *NEA Proceedings* for 1933 and 1934, should be required reading for all students of

---

Dr. Corey is State Executive Secretary of the California Teachers Association, Burlingame, California.

school finance. Time limitation forces us to limit our consideration to but one activity of the Commission. A grant of $4,750 was secured from the Carnegie Corporation, and it was decided to conduct a National Conference on School Finance at Teachers College during the summer of 1933. Nicholas Murray Butler gave his enthusiastic support to the idea, and the work conference was held with 27 regular participants. This was a serious work conference which lasted for two weeks. There were giants abroad in those days, and many of them were there. In addition to John K. Norton, the chairman, and William F. Russell, the President of Teachers College, there were Paul R. Mort, Payson Smith, George D. Strayer, George F. Zook, Willard E. Givens, N. L. Engelhardt, Howard A. Dawson, Eugene S. Lawler, Fred Kelly, Alfred D. Simpson, Walter D. Cocking, and William G. Carr.

The report of this historic conference is long out of print and now rests safely in the archives of the NEA. These men were not stampeded by the hysteria of the moment and took the long look. They addressed themselves to the same subject which has been assigned for this presentation; namely, what are the essentials of a modern school finance program? The results of their deliberations may be found on pages 9-10 of the official report of the conference, and have been reprinted many times through the years in NEA publications, including a recent issue (February 1966) of the *CEF Report* of the NEA Committee on Educational Finance. This comparatively brief statement goes far in answering the question posed in our topic, and the fact that it is still so timely attests to the wisdom of the men who drafted it 30 years ago. Knowing many of these men personally and having known others now dead, I covet the privilege of having heard the discussion, but we must be content with printed words:

BELIEVING that the financing of schools is a paramount public concern, basic to the present and future welfare of our democracy, the following program is offered for action by the American people.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Universal education — Funds to provide every child and youth a complete educational opportunity from early childhood to the age at which employment is possible and socially desirable. This right to be preserved regardless of residence, race, or economic status and to constitute an inalienable claim on the resources of local, state, and national governments.

Lifelong learning — Educational opportunities at public expense for every adult whenever such opportunities are required in the public interest.

Effective teaching—In every classroom competent teachers maintained at an economic level which will secure a high quality of socially motivated and broadly trained professional service.

ADEQUATE REVENUES

Equitable taxation—For the adequate support of all governmental activities, including the schools, a stable, varied, and flexible tax system, providing for a just sharing of the cost of government by all members of the community.

Public information—Accurate, intelligible, and frequent reports to taxpayers and the public on the management of the school money so that complete understanding and constructive attitudes with respect to school taxes and services may prevail.

CONSTRUCTIVE ECONOMY

Schoolboard independence—In every school system a board of education responsive to the will of the whole people and free to adopt and carry out truly efficient and economical financial policies for the schools.

Economical administration—A uniform and continuous policy of honest, economical and productive spending of all school moneys.

LOCAL MANAGEMENT

Adequate local units—In every community trained educational leadership and other services secured thru a local unit of school administration large enough to make such services financially possible and desirable.

Community initiative—For every school district the right to offer its children an education superior to state minimum standards and to seek and develop new methods intended to improve the work of the schools.

STATE RESPONSIBILITY

Equalization of educational opportunity—For every school district, sufficient financial support from the state to permit the maintenance of an acceptable state minimum program of education and to relieve the local property tax when this tax, upon which local initiative depends, is carrying an unfair share of the cost of government.

Professional leadership—Competent leadership in every state department of education so that reasonable minimum financial standards may be established and educational progress encouraged thruout the state.

Fiscal planning—In every state a longtime financial plan for public education, comprehensive in scope, based on experienced judgment and objective data, cooperatively developed, continually subject to review and revision, and reflecting faithfully the broad educational policy of the people.

NATIONAL INTEREST

Open schools—For every child deprived of education by emergency conditions beyond the control of his own community and state, immediate restoration of these rights thru assistance from the federal government to the state concerned.

Federal support—Sufficient federal support for the schools of the several states to protect the nation's interest in an educated citizenship, without federal control over state and local educational policies.

IF AMERICA IS TO RECOVER PROSPERITY AND PERSIST AS A DEMOCRATIC NATION THESE ESSENTIALS MUST BE PROVIDED.

This document uses words such as *just, equitable, adequate, acceptable,* and *quality*. The flexibility of these words gives the Charter a sort of timelessness, but unless they are constantly re-defined with the passage of time, such statements become meaningless generalities. The conference in 1933 went a long way toward giving specific meaning to these words at that time, and it is our challenge to re-define them today.

The essentials of a modern program of school finance must be found in the answers to three pertinent questions:

1. What is a defensible definition for complete educational opportunity for the American people?
2. What revenue will be required to support, adequately, such an educational program?
3. What is the local, state, and federal responsibility in meeting such costs and administering such a program?

If answers to these questions could be agreed upon, and educational opportunity, adequacy, and responsibility so defined, the Charter of 1933 is as good today as it was then. Each question will be discussed briefly in turn.

It seems immediately obvious that the limits of necessary educational opportunity are steadily broadening. Research now indicates that children suffering under certain types of deprivation should be given school experiences as early as three years of age. A recent publication of the Educational Policies Commission[1] proposes that two years of education beyond high school be made available to all, and bases this recommendation on social and civic imperatives. There seems to be a growing conviction that high-quality education at all levels is an absolute prerequisite of an automated economy. The importance of technology should not be underestimated, but on the other hand, technology is only one aspect of the economic revolution. New value structures must be built, and this is in the realm of the humanities. Full employment in the future will require more of the work force to deal with people rather than things. The accelerating pace of science and technology has been directed largely toward changing man's environment, and has been so successful that the new environment forces man to change himself. As science changes man's relation to his environment, survival demands that man change his relationship to man. This is to say that there is an inescapable interdependence between technological and humanistic education. The imperative for mass education in the new economy is found in the fact that these objectives are just as important for those who never get to college or university, as they are for those who study in our graduate schools and research institutes. The education program for the bottom 50 percent in what we have been pleased to call ability must be our grave concern if we are expecting to come anywhere near full employment in the future.

---

[1] National Education Association and American Association of School Administrators, Educational Policies Commission. *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School.* Washington, D.C.: the Commission, 1964. 36 p.

So much for the philosophy of the situation. The facts are already upon us while we yet ponder our theories. More than one-fourth of the total population is now engaged directly in education (51 million students and 2 million teachers) and within a few years this group will comprise more than a third of all our people.

In summary—every American child should receive nine years of elementary education, including a year of kindergarten. Virtually every child should receive four years of high-school education, and junior or community colleges should offer two additional years of education to all who desire it. The school year should be at least 180 days for all, and should be supplemented by an additional summer session of at least 25 days for those who wish to attend. Any American at any age should find academic, vocational, and recreational opportunities through free adult education in the public schools.

Special programs should be provided for the retarded, the gifted, the deaf, the blind, and the seriously handicapped. These programs must have specially prepared teachers and the appropriate special equipment, without which the unique needs of these groups cannot be met, and should begin at whatever age the child needs the program.

There may be many who will not now support all aspects of this total program, but there is ample evidence that the American people will not be satisfied with less. There are a few communities in our country where most of these elements may be found, and the trend is in this direction everywhere. This is the kind of program we must be prepared to finance in the future.

Every classroom should be staffed with a competent, well-trained teacher. Adequate counseling, as well as medical and psychiatric services, should be provided at all levels, and school buildings should be functional, safe, healthful, and beautiful.

We may now tackle the second question. What revenue will be required to support such an educational program? The device so often used to compute educational need has been the minimum foundation program. Many critics are now pointing out that there are elements in the practical application of the foundation program concept which cry for re-evaluation.

Foundation programs are utterly unrealistic in that in many states they embrace only part of the educational program. If the school offers 13 or 15 years of instruction, it is patently unfair to have only 12 years included in the foundation program. Such state policy merely guarantees that none but the children in wealthy districts may have kindergartens or community colleges.

The minimum acceptable philosophy of the foundation program has been figured to meet the needs of that unfortunate child who is average, has no handicaps, and, along with 35 or 40 others, can be handled by a single teacher.

It is in the state and national interest to guarantee each child a quality program instead of a minimum experience. Many states refuse to recognize that counselors, librarians, psychologists, or physicians must be included in a defensible program of education, and hence such services are not included in the foundation program. In many states poor districts must load themselves with local taxes to provide essential services not covered by the foundation program. Adequacy is an essential element in a modern program of school finance, and cleverer or easier ways to finance the *status quo* in education cannot now be accepted as adequate.

During the last 30 years, I have been involved in many campaigns to secure public acceptance of increased financial support for California schools. One thing I have learned. One may talk about dollars by the hour, but no one seems to get very much excited except the tax control groups. However, when one starts to talk about services to children, one notices the faces of one's listeners light up with interest. As our population increases and urbanization continues, it may well be that elementary schools will become larger than they have been in many parts of the country. For purposes of discussion, let us assume that in the future a typical elementary school will serve 750 pupils.

Would it not be defensible to have a physician to provide preventive and remedial medical services to 750 children? In many areas of this country health services to pupils in the schools is woefully inadequate and in many communities almost nonexistent. In many areas health examinations are infrequent and cursory. Children grow up and display adult disabilities, which if discovered and treated in childhood, could have been prevented. Almost no one would deny that working with the physician should be a specially trained nurse. A full-time psychologist and a competent psychometrist would be kept very busy. Certainly a trained librarian would be imperative. Each school should have a competent research director to plan and conduct studies connected with instruction, innovation, and evaluation. Every such elementary school should have at least two experts in the teaching of reading to work with all teachers and to study especially stubborn reading problems in individual pupils. Each such school should have from two to four counselors, depending on the nature of the pupil population.

Such a school should have 30 teachers which would make possible a class size of 25 pupils. The average salary of these teachers should be at least $10,000, and each grade level should have a teacher chairman, with an extra $2,000 salary and an assistant chairman with $1,000 above the regular schedule. The principal would be able to give his attention almost exclusively to planning and supervising the educational program, and one or more vice-principals would take care of the clerical and noninstructional administrative details, which now absorb so much of an elementary-school principal's time. Mechanical and electronic devices which are useful in stimulating learning should be available wherever appropriate and technical experts in special fields could be called in from a central service agency. Not fewer than one secretary for each three teachers would be provided, and all noninstructional record keeping would be done by a clerical staff in the school office.

This brief sketch, in bold outline only, of an elementary school is neither reverie nor fantasy. It describes what we already know we should be doing in an educational program for young children. It is neither revolutionary nor innovative. Such a school would be organized merely to do what we have long preached we should be doing in elementary education. The only aspect of this picture which could be considered revolutionary is that it would cost about $1,000 per pupil per year in current expense. If this be dreaming, school finance leaders should do more dreaming. In fact, we are being told that this is the kind of school needed in the culturally deprived areas of our big cities. This is the kind of school program which every American child deserves, whether he lives in Watts or Beverly Hills.

It is unnecessary to detail what a high school of similar quality would be like. The picture would be far more complex and would probably represent more drastic departure from tradition. With really adequate elementary schools, the problems faced in secondary education would be far less acute. Pupils' problems would be diagnosed and at least partially solved before they left the elementary school. Personnel records would be so much more nearly complete that the secondary school could relatively easily develop the program to meet the individual child's needs.

We have been too timid in defining the financial needs of the schools. Projections of school costs have been consistently too low. In 1960, I predicted that the per-pupil cost of the public elementary and secondary schools in the United States should be $720 per unit of ADA in 1970. I thought I was being very bold, and continued to outline the tremendous deficit in the expected revenue which would be available to meet the need of 1970. The facts are that halfway through the decade two states have already exceeded my figure and nine more are within striking distance of it. There is every reason to believe that my bold projection will be proven to be conservative and therefore timid.

The answer, then, to our second question may not be sanguine or satisfying, but a modern finance program is *adequate* only in terms of how nearly it comes to giving children the best education we know how to give.

The most confusing and critical issue in outlining the essentials of a modern finance program is the definition of the manner in which the responsibility is to be shared by local, state, and federal agencies. Education has long been recognized as a state responsibility, but the degree to which the responsibility, both for support and control, has been delegated to local units varies widely from state to state. However, the trend has been definitely in the direction of state control with specific plans for sharing the cost between the state and local authority. The states generally have withdrawn local controls more rapidly than they have assumed the cost. Although significant local autonomy still exists, it develops through the latitude permitted in the local administration of broad programs and policies determined by the state. The local and state relationship is far from uniform, but trends have developed and we are in possession of theory and experience which, if utilized, can result in a fairer sharing of school support.

It is the long-awaited emergence of the national government as a substantial contributor to the financial support of the schools which now threatens to disturb the progress which has been made in developing an equitable partnership in school support between the local agency and the state. Federal aid could well reach $10 billion annually within a few years, and it is probable that relatively little of this money will even be considered in calculating state foundation programs. Speaking before this conference six years ago I made a proposal which I reiterate now.

> The present moment would be a propitious time for the initiation of a national study which would bring together our best leadership, with an adequate staff of technicians, to study the problems involved in integrating large scale federal support into state systems of school finance. Such a study should involve our best theoretical experts, practical practitioners in governmental relations and economists. It should be well financed and publicized. A group like this should ignore traditions and develop a workable blueprint for a national program of school support which would involve the systematic integration of local, state, and national resources. There need be no implication that states would be compelled to follow such a plan, but the existence of responsible and authoritative recommendations would go far in encouraging states to use federal funds with wisdom.[3]

Public education is in a position very much like the poor little rich girl whose parents both love her but they are separated and have little to do with each other, so she faces the cold winter with two pairs of mittens, four beautiful and expensive hats and caps, two pairs of overshoes but with no warm overcoat.

The last sentence of the report of the 1933 conference suggests the necessity for a national foundation program. If any true partnership in school finance is to be developed, the partners must coordinate their efforts in some kind of over-all plan. To those who always conjure up the specter of federal control, one may now assert that some sort of coordinated federal and state plan is the surest way to avoid it. This is the immediate challenge which faces this conference and which should be faced resolutely by the school-finance "establishment."

This word originally was used to define the established church in Britain. During the latter half of the nineteenth century, the privileges and perquisites of the established church in Ireland and Wales came under bitter and violent attack from the "disestablishmentarians." The friends of the church thus came to be known as "antidisestablishmentarians" and the double negative was used as the description of the positive attitude of friendship and support. As children we were wont to display our erudition by acquaintance with the fact that "antidisestablishmentarianism" was, and is, the longest word in the English dictionary. I cannot recall anyone ever asking what the word meant. It is a very silly and pedantic way of defining support and encouragement for the "establishment." The idea may be ridiculous enough to delineate the thesis which I here propose. This is no time for "disestablishment" in the field of school finance. I am a vigorous "antidisestablishmentarian."

I recently attended a meeting of lay leaders, businessmen, and politicians. A proposed school apportionment bill, which had been drawn by members of the legislature, without professional assistance, was being discussed. A member of the group, himself a school finance expert, declared acidly that it was a better bill than had ever been offered by the "establishment." The connotation was inescapable. Whether he meant it that way or not, many of those present accepted his statement as a public resignation from the "establishment."

---

[3] Corey, Arthur F. "Issues and Trends in Public School Finance." *New Directions in Financing Public Schools.* Proceedings of the Third National School Finance Conference Sponsored by the Committee on Educational Finance. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960. p. 16-17.

More than ever before we need men and women who make lifetime careers of becoming expert on how America should raise and distribute the money for the support of public education. The educational economist—quite respectable of late—is no substitute for the expert in school finance.

In review—the modern finance program has three basic attributes. It provides a program complete enough to meet the needs of all citizens, it provides adequate financial support, and it divides the responsibility for such support equitably among the three levels of government. It is complete, adequate, and just. California approaches satisfactory breadth, New York comes nearest to succeeding in adequacy, and the federal-state relationship must still be worked out. This creative work in my opinion, must be done outside governmental circles, and many of you in this presence are just the people who will have to do it.

I have always been fascinated by the Biblical story of Esther. Mordecai's advice to Esther, when she was faced by a distressing and onerous responsibility, is good advice for all of us.

> For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall. . . . thou and thy father's house be destroyed, and who knoweth whether thou art come to the kingdom for such a time as this.

The Outlook for State and Local Governments

Selma J. Mushkin

EXCITEMENT about state and local governmental affairs is running high in our nation today. It originates in the rapid change that characterizes all of our society, a change spurred by new technology, which, in turn, gives rise to more new technology. Some day we shall characterize the 10 years 1965-1975 as the decade of "science in government," the time when state and local governments turned the light of scientific inquiry on the affairs of government itself. Creative federalism, in my view, means intergovernmental aid and cooperative action directed toward achieving that objective.

Technology and Program Content

State and local governments' programming patently is influenced by scientific advances, and in the period ahead new knowledge and techniques may be expected to continue to alter spending patterns. The new technology applied to city fringe-area growth has produced circumferential highways. New methods of treating mental illness shorten dramatically the length of stay in mental hospitals. The incidence of tuberculosis has been reduced by disease control work; and the length of stay in tuberculosis hospitals has been cut by chemotherapy, so that many such hospitals have been closed or converted to other uses. New medical discoveries are lowering the social costs of infectious and contagious diseases and are causing a reorientation of public health work.

Not all of the scientific advances and technological developments have been cost reducing. Nuclear testing necessitates a monitoring of milk supplies. Nuclear wastes, both industrial and governmental, create new problems of waste disposal. Pesticides now threaten our recreational areas as well as our water supplies; automobile exhaust has added to problems of air pollution, and detergents to the difficulties of control of water pollution. Larger and faster aircraft make lowering of noise levels an important aspect of public programming.

The course on which we have begun suggests that the technology we know is crude compared with what it will become. Saline water research offers some promise of providing an alternative path to meeting our growing water requirements. Rapid intercity ground transit is in the offing. Computers, reading machines, and new reproduction processes will change radically the procedures of government, including methods of crime detection, tax collection, governmental procurement, and the eligibility determination of public beneficiaries.

Dr. Mushkin is Project Director of The Council of State Governments, Washington, D. C. This paper draws on the work of a project of research and education on state and local finances supported by a special grant from the Ford Foundation to The George Washington University, Washington, D. C.

Education, which plays a central role in scientific progress, has also been affected by these fundamental changes. Scientific advances have contributed new technology, which has applicability in the school. Technology has produced education by televison. New teaching aids, such as electronically programmed instruction, have been brought to the classrooms; and new reproduction devices are transforming notions about textbooks and reading materials for classroom use. Information storage and retrieval systems and televised communication systems, as well as computers and computerized translators, will facilitate and deepen research in the universities. More importantly, curriculum and course content will be altered.

The launching of the first space satellite was the striking scientific advance that galvanized the nations in the West, especially the United States, to reassess their scientific position and to reform and upgrade mathematics and science education. New textbooks for use in the high school were developed under university auspices, retraining programs for high-school teachers were established, and summer school programs were set up for gifted high-school students. Federal grant programs were established for equipping laboratories for school science, language, and mathematics, and for encouraging the design of new teaching aids. Change continues, and if education is not to transmit more and more outmoded concepts of the past, the educational establishment must seek out institutional arrangements that can adapt to this rapid pace of change.

In preparing 1970 projections of revenues and expenditures for the states and localites, we have asked: What are the potential consequences of new technology for the programs of the states and localities and for the outlays required for their implementation? Wherever we could, we asked experts: What is in the offing, and when will it come? In Project '70 we have reflected those answers.

Scientific Inquiry and Program Design

Scientific inquiry has taken a new course and a more vital one. Repeated emphases on the gap between the progress of the physical and biological sciences and that of the social science disciplines that have a bearing on social invention and on social and economic policy appear to have at last yielded results. A breakthrough in the social sciences lies ahead; with that breakthrough will come the opportunity for dealing with basic problems of today and tomorrow.

We appear at last to have learned that research pays off and that research is as relevant to the programs of government as it is to industrial processes and to conquest of outer space. Foundations, industry, and the national government have begun the support of research on governmental affairs. However, it was the governor of one of our states that gave the innovational direction to research on the affairs of government and to the application of aerospace technology to problems of public policy.[1]

---

[1] Aerojet General Corporation. *California Waste Management Study*. Report to State of California, Department of Public Health. Azusa, Calif.: the Corporation, August 1965.

Lockheed Missiles & Space Company. *California Statewide Information System, Final Report*. Sunnyvale, Calif.: the Company, July 30, 1965.

North American Aviation. *California: Integrated Transportation Study*. Los Angeles: North American Aviation, September 1965.

Space General Corporation. *Prevention and Control of Crime and Delinquency*. Final Report to Youth and Adult Correction Agency, State of California. El Monte, Calif.: the Corporation, July 1965.

Critical economic issues in terms of state and local programming for the period ahead center on two types of questions: How much expansion in state and local activity is (a) necessary and (b) efficient? "Necessary" is used in the sense of "needed to offset automation and productivity gains in the goods-producing sectors of the economy, and to provide employment for new entrants into the labor force." "Efficient" is used in the sense of "providing such public services as yield a higher marginal return than alternative uses of the resources."

In the research that is being focused on those and related issues, the traditional, the accepted, and the dogma are being set aside. Basic questions that relate to policy positions and expenditure decisions are being asked. Some examples of the research questions may serve to clarify one direction of this policy-oriented research. Social service programs rest on the notion of individual or family counseling. Yet, the question has been raised: If the best of social services is made available, is malbehavior corrected? Specialists in correctional institutions for juveniles have set standards for good correctional care. And the question being studied is: Is there a payoff when such standards are applied? For many decades the need for prenatal care has been a basic tenet. And now studies are being made to help answer the question: What is the difference in outcome between provision of prenatal care and no such provision?

Economic research has underscored the importance of investment in people through education as a source of economic growth. Drawing on this research, state and local governments look to education as a way of carrying out their objectives for economic development. A routine function of state and local governments thus takes on a new vitality as an instrument for achieving economic ends, and added weight is put on the major decisions on allocation of resources for education.

One-third of all expenditures of states and localities now is devoted to educational services and facilities; members of school staffs account for 48 percent of state and local employees, and the salaries of those staffs for 52 percent of state and local payrolls. Of the total capital outlays undertaken by the states and localities, over $5 billion per year or about 24 percent goes for school plants and related educational facilities. We have projected educational outlays of states and localities to reach $44 billion by 1970 if a gross national product of $864 billion is reached, and more than $48 billion if the current rates of increase are maintained and the GNP reaches $918 billion. The size of these outlays suggests that the research base for educational decision-making should be vastly enlarged.

The role of education in economic growth has been established through research findings; the ways of optimizing the use of resources devoted to education have not. The questions are many and fundamental: How do individuals learn? Are there different learning patterns for different children? What are the characteristics of individuals in relation to their learning patterns? Or, stated differently, is there a way to identify the most effective way of teaching children in accord with their own learning patterns? What, in any case, is the best way to teach in terms of the way children learn? How are children motivated to learn? How are teachers motivated to teach, particularly to teach children from different cultural backgrounds? At what age does that complex computer system that is the human brain "program" most readily, and for what types of problems? At what age will that system not respond to what types of stimuli? How should teachers be trained? The questions are many, and answers will not be obtained except through the hard and costly route of scientific inquiry. Of considerable significance, however, is the fact that the awkward questions about the underpinnings of educational theory and practices are being raised with that measure of skepticism that is the strength of science.

Even as we examine anew the fundamental precepts of education for the young, it is necessary, too, to ask: What are the costs of educational obsolescence in the adult population, and what are the alternative arrangements for refreshing and retraining adults? Elsewhere, I proposed a system of social insurance protection against the risk of educational obsolescence, through which income could be maintained over a period of retraining, at the option of the persons covered by the system or, in brief, a sabbatical leave system for all employees.[2] I should like to suggest an amendment to my original proposal. Whatever the reasons, the younger generation of today has a strong sense of participation, a desire for action, a yearning to become a part of the doing in the real nonschool world.

Perhaps now is the time to ask: Do we want to continue to lengthen the period of schooling undergone before entrance into the work force? Or do we want to shorten the period of elementary and secondary schooling, perhaps adding a pre-primary grade or two before kindergarten, thus reducing the usual age of high-school graduation to 16? As one method for dealing with the present screening practices of employers and the burdens of these practices on school dropouts, the Secretary of Labor has proposed continuation of the period of compulsory schooling until age 18. The same effect would be gained by moving in the opposite direction, that is, lowering the school-leaving age. And young people could then choose between immediate continuation of education through junior colleges, technical institutes, or universities, or later continuation through appropriate institutions for such education.

Each of the professions reviewing the state of its art concludes that basic training requirements for entry into the profession must be upgraded and the schooling period increased. More, rather than less, postponement of active participation in the labor force would result. An institutional arrangement for maintaining income for persons in the work force who return to school, coupled with a generalized program of continuing education, would permit those who elected to do so to go to work and then return to school. Education would be viewed as a continuing process. Certainly the experience after World War II with educational allowances for veterans indicates that motivation and performance are improved rather than weakened by a break in continuity of education.

It is not the objective here to discuss or elaborate these or other proposals, but rather to emphasize again that change will undoubtedly characterize the years ahead. More resources devoted to research in the social sciences will accelerate the pace of the questioning and the search for answers. We can expect that in the social sciences, as in the biological and physical sciences, the question will beget answers, and the answers, new questions.

---

[2] Paper prepared for the International Economic Association Conference on the Economics of Education, Menthon St. Bernard, France, August 29-September 7, 1963.

Scientific Yardsticks for Decision-Making

The intensity of such probings may be expected to grow as program budgeting becomes an established practice. The concept of program budgeting is certainly not new; it was fostered by the First Hoover Commission as an instrument to facilitate executive and legislative budgetary reviews. As an aftermath, the national government, as well as some states and communities, undertook to group expenditures by major functions. The present program budgeting efforts, however, are more explicitly directed toward clearly identifying a group of public services that have a common objective and to assessing program payoffs.

The planning-programming-budgeting system may be viewed as a tool that provides the policy-maker with a systematic analysis of expected benefits and costs of alternative courses of action to reach a given policy objective or goal. It is also a tool for budgeting, which places annual or biennial budgets in the context of a long-range, phased governmental program.

The system must be tailored to meet the requirements of each government agency. There is no common prescription. However, the major components of a planning-programming-budgeting system are:

1. An output-orientated program structure that reflects, for each major mission of each agency, the program categories with supporting elements

2. A program structure that clarifies specific goals, which are expressed in quantitative and measurable terms

3. Identification and continual analysis of the utility and costs of alternative time-phased programs as they relate to stated goals and objectives in order to assure a balanced use of available resources

4. The preparation of multi-year programs and financial plans, with supporting analyses, to aid in the preparation of annual budgets with fuller understanding of subsequent years' impact

5. The establishment of a cycle that allows updating of program and financial plans as required during the current year, and revisions for the subsequent budget year.

The State and Local Finances Project, partially with Ford Foundation support, is undertaking a pilot study of the development of planning-programming-budgeting systems for states and localities as a follow-up and extension of Project '70. The pilot study will be carried out on an experimental basis in five states, as many counties, and several cities.

Project '70 Findings

Project '70 was undertaken more than two years ago as a multi-purpose research exercise:

1. To determine the likely future impact of state and local government on the national economy

2. To measure the impact of national policy directions on the expenditure programs of the states

3. To experiment with a new measure of fiscal capacity, a measure that would help answer the question, What are the differences in the capacity of the states to meet their expenditure requirements?

More than a research objective was in mind; we planned that the study be conducted in such a way that the states would be involved in the processes of projection and be encouraged, through this involvement, to engage in their own advance fiscal planning and programming. In many ways, this was a unique undertaking. We have had individual state studies on financing and national projections of state-local finances, but for the first time, Project '70 undertook within a consistent frame-work to project on a highly disaggregate basis revenues by source and expenditures by function for each of the 51 jurisdictions in the United States. Within a national economic model, states were asked to project their own state tax revenues, adhering to state-by-state projections of population, income, labor force, and some of the measures of the tax bases that were uniformly constructed in accord with the national economic model. The degree of cooperation was as unique as the attempt to obtain consistent information from all the states.

Many persons have seen our two functional reports on projected expenditures for education: (a) *Public Spending for Higher Education in 1970*[3] and (b) *Local School Expenditures: 1970 Projections.*[4] In those reports as well as in those for other functional areas we attempted for the calendar year 1970 a set of projections that would reflect the changes in workload and the cost per workload unit, building into the projections a more or less uniform response of voter-consumer in each state to the direction of national policies.

We projected 1970 expenditures for public colleges and universities at $12.1 billion, and expenditures for local schools at $31.0 billion, with an aggregate for all education, including manpower training programs, of $44 billion. Total state-local general expenditures were projected at over $108 billion, a figure 79 percent above the outlays of $60 billion of the base year (fiscal 1962) and 56 percent higher than 1963-64 general expenditures.

The projected growth in federal aid and contract research support from $10 billion in 1963-64 to over $22 billion in 1970 would facilitate the financing of general expenditures at the $108 billion level without increases in state and local taxes. While the road has been cleared for such augmentation of federal grant-in-aid support of required public services in the states and localities, the journey is not without its hazards. Grant appropriation processes are far from automatic.

A relatively favorable fiscal outlook for the period ahead reflects a series of demographic and program factors, including (a) the slackened rate of growth of school-age population; (b) the slowing down of the rate of increase in highway construction as the inter-state system reaches completion; (c) the continuing drop-off in the rate of utilization of public hospitals, both mental hospitals and general hospitals, as voluntary health insurance expands and the national Medicare program comes into operation; and (d) the acceleration of the rate of decline of old-age assistance case loads, as more of the aged gain protection under the national social insurance program.

There are offsetting factors at work as well, including accommodation of public colleges and universities to the growth in enrollments and at the same time to improvement of the quality of education. And new programs have been initiated, including the attack on poverty, the broadened program of regional economic growth, and the necessary expansion of the various programs designed to make our cities desirable places in which to live and to work.

---

[3] Mushkin, Selma J., and McLoone, Eugene P. *Public Spending for Higher Education in 1970.* Chicago: Council of State Governments, February 1965. 68 p.

[4] Mushkin, Selma J., and McLoone, Eugene P. *Local School Expenditures: 1970 Projections.* Chicago: Council of State Governments, November 1965. 84 p.

We have projected taxes of states and localities to reach $70 billion by 1970 and, together with fees and charges, total revenue from their own sources to reach $85 billion, an amount almost 70 percent above base-year 1962 levels and 45 percent above 1963-64 levels.

State-by-state revenue-expenditure ratios as projected for 1970 reflect the relative fiscal pressures on the industrial and on the agricultural states. In the past seven years the tax effort of the two most populous high-income states has increased more than has that of the low-income states, and the outlook is for further disparity.

The projections of both expenditures and taxes are closely tied to a national economic model for 1970. Assumed was a growth of gross national product to $864 billion by 1970, with unemployment at a 4-percent rate, a growth in real product of 4.1 percent per year, and a rise in prices of 1.5 percent per year.

Recent gains in employment and in gross product indicate a sharper rise than we assumed on the average. Accordingly, in an effort to make a rough adjustment of both tax revenues and expenditures to take account of the growth experience during the past three quarters, we selected another economic model, one that assumes a 3-percent unemployment rate, a somewhat higher productivity gain (without any offsetting reductions in hours of work) and a gross national product of $918 billion for 1970.

Taxes at this gross national product level are projected to amount to almost $5 billion more—to reach about $75 billion—and charges to amount to $1 billion more, bringing about a total for general revenues from "own" sources of $91 billion. Because of higher competitive wage and salary levels, state and local general expenditures with the same extensions in scope and quality would reach not $108 billion but $115 billion. The spread on a nationwide basis between revenues and expenditures would be widened. However, if federal aids in the amount projected augment states' and localities' own revenues, the general fiscal outlook would continue to be favorable for meeting public-service requirements.

It should be emphasized that the projections at both the $864 billion GNP level and the $918 billion GNP level are not projections of expenditures for a "desirable" or even "necessary" standard of public services. Our task was a more circumscribed one; namely, to project state and local expenditures within a framework of economic assumptions that would reflect past state and local governmental performance, changes in public beneficiary loads, and the expansion that appears to be in the offing as a consequence of current national policy discussions.

A pricing of "needs" for public services and facilities could result in a higher expenditure total and a different pattern of expenditure among functions and regions. A clearer identification of program goals that is implicit in program budgeting would facilitate such measurement of the price of public services on a needs basis.

Research Tasks

One research task is to identify costs and benefits of public services so that specific program measures are related to a general "bundle of investments in people." We need to know considerably more than we do; for example, the combinations of education, health, and welfare services that will most effectively and efficiently enlarge the productive capacity of people and the effectiveness of their consumption outlays. Paths to investment in human beings are many. The efficiency added per one dollar of allocated resource undoubtedly varies, depending on the combination of public services that becomes available.

Moreover, research is urgently needed to permit some evaluation of the time-cost trade-off in public spending. For example, by spending far more now on education of the culturally disadvantaged, subsequent outlays for education may be reduced. To take another example, let us ask over what period of time can we deal with children's dental problems so as to avoid incurring additional costs of $1 billion, $2 billion, or more in work time lost by the adult population? Health practitioners know for some specific diseases, such as hookworm, budget allocations for control measures among a population group, spread over a period, let us say for 20 percent of the population in each of five years, will, at the end, yield no return; reinfection will occur just as fast as the disease control work progresses. But with many other disease control and program areas we know very little about these time-cost trade-offs. Application of epidemiological methods to public-service problems may help to provide a sounder basis for decision-making.

Implementation Processes

Thus, technology is changing the structure of public programs. The application of scientific techniques to governmental affairs is leading to questioning of the basic assumptions underlying public program design and arrangements. As a consequence, innovations in public programming are likely to be accelerated. How do we best preserve institutional stability in an unstable world, and achieve at the same time an optimum rate of change? Fortunately, we are learning something about the processes of communication and implementation of ideas. An example drawn from the field of education is most striking. Two years ago, Dr. James B. Conant wrote in his *Shaping Educational Policy:*

> Let me be bold and make a suggestion for a possible way by which the road to the development of a nationwide educational policy might be opened up. *Let the fifty states, or at least fifteen to twenty of the more populous states, enter into a compact for the creation of an "Interstate Commission for Planning a Nationwide Educational Policy".*[5]

By 1965, a Planning Conference for the Compact for Education met in Kansas City and approved an agreement set forth in a Compact document to be transmitted to the states; the National Governors' Conference unanimously adopted a resolution of endorsement, as did the National Legislative Conference. As of March 1966, 16 states have adopted the Compact agreement. Whatever one's view of the idea, the time interval between the proposal and the present stage of implementation is something of a record in public policy. It was the combination of an idea, the energy and competence of a Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina, and the necessary foundation financial support that made it possible.

---

[5] Conant, James B. *Shaping Educational Policy.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965. p. 123.

The Compact for Education

Ronald D. Moskowitz

WHEN I WORKED with Governor Brown, I was amazed at how much of a governor's job centered on education. Governor Brown once told me that when he looked at all of the various kinds of problems that crossed his desk each day, when he studied and analyzed them, and evaluated what could be done to solve them, the answer almost always came down to one word: *education.*

Education may not be the cure-all for every human dilemma, but it is usually the beginning of the cure. And that is why, among all of the matters that came to his attention, none was of more concern to him than education. That is why it has had his top priority since he took office in 1959.

I also learned that Governor Brown is not alone in his concern about education. It is shared today by every governor in the United States. It is not a secret that politicians all depend on polls to a great degree to find out what concerns the public. And a recent Gallup Poll showed that the improvement of education is the first concern of the vast majority of Americans today. This is good. This concern has helped move education into a happier, healthier climate than ever before.

But concern is not enough. It must lead to more progress and improvement. To achieve this improvement, our education industry must be almost completely retooled.

The job is so mammoth that it simply cannot be done by educators alone. For years, now, any major improvement that has taken place in public education has been a cooperative venture between education leaders and political leaders. The reason is simple. The taxpayers pay the bills for public education. The great majority of that tax money is administered, however, not by the educators, but by the politicians, whom the taxpayers have elected. Since almost every really major improvement in education takes major tax expenditures, it just stands to reason that improvements in public education must take place through the cooperative efforts of educators, legislators, and governors.

An educator can have a great idea for improving education. But if he does not have the money to back it, he might well never have had the idea. That is why I have been constantly amazed at those educators whose theme song is "Let's keep politics out of education." If educators were truly successful in keeping all politics out of education, the only predictable result would be continuation of *status quo.*

For as long as there has been public education in the United States, education has been the child of politics. For too long in some states it has been the stepchild. But this is changing. In fact, it has already changed. For the first time in America, everyone realizes that good education is necessary to the survival of this country. So I do not think you will ever again find the governor of a state playing stepfather to public education.

Mr. Moskowitz is Associate Director of the Education Commission of the States, The Compact for Education, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

Education is the major plank in almost every governor's campaign platform today. The politician needs the educator as much as the educator has always needed the politician. This is what Conant found as he toured the United States evaluating our current efforts in public education. Therefore, in his latest book, *Shaping Educational Policy,*[1] he suggested that the political and educational leaders in each state form a partnership for the betterment of education, and that the states form a similar partnership among themselves.

Conant said that this country was too diverse to ever want or have a national educational policy with a centralized office and one national education policy for all. But he also pointed out that education was too important today to be left to the unconnected efforts of local leaders or the uncoordinated efforts of state leaders. What was needed, he said, was not a national educational policy, but a nationwide educational policy. Let me assure you that this was more than just some fancy semantics. There is a real difference.

A national educational policy would be handed down from one centralized authority, whereas a nationwide educational policy would be developed by the states themselves. So Conant suggested that the states do just that—develop a nationwide educational policy by joining together into a legal compact each state's top educators and each state's top politicians.

The book appeared just as Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina was going out of office. Governor Sanford was already deeply involved at that time with a foundation-supported venture called a Study of American States, which was designed to offer recommendations for strengthening state government.

He had already discovered that the chief job of every state was education. He knew that it was the one area of interest that the Constitution of the United States had specifically left to the states. And he saw in Conant's suggestion a ready-made way to strengthen state government. And so he eagerly took Conant's idea and ran with it.

Using other foundation funds, he decided to find out if there was acceptance among the educational and political leaders of each state for such a Compact. Several large fact-finding meetings were held and the consensus at each was to proceed.

Late last summer, Governor Sanford invited state and territorial governors to an organizational meeting in Kansas City on September 29-30. He expected that 18 or 20 states would send the delegations he had requested. You can imagine his joy when every state and territory showed up eager to learn more about the Compact.

Governor Sanford also hoped that the Kansas City delegations might again reach a consensus to proceed. They did. They gave him a green light and told him to set up the Compact. Nineteen governors appeared personally at the meeting, and most of them left with Governor Sanford declarations of intention to support the new Compact.

An interim steering committee headed by Governor John Chafee of Rhode Island and composed of 10 governors and 20 educators and legislators was elected. The committee was asked to keep organizational efforts going until the Compact was accepted by 10 states and became legally operable.

---

[1] Conant, James B. *Shaping Educational Policy.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965. 139 p.

The first meeting of the interim steering committee was held last December in New York City. The committee arranged for the hiring of the initial staff and took care of other organizational details necessary to help guide the new organization through its first months.

The states came in slowly at first. By January, there were only six. But by mid-February, the 10 states necessary to make the Compact legally operable had signed up: Arkansas, the Virgin Islands, Hawaii, New Jersey, Minnesota, Illinois, Texas, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Rhode Island.

There was a little trouble about who was going to be Number Ten. Both Governor Chafee of Rhode Island and Governor Campbell of New Mexico wanted the honor of being the tenth member state which made the Compact legally operable. They both knew that their bills were making the same progress through their respective legislatures and, in fact, were each trying to make sure that the other came in first as the ninth state.

As it would happen, the bills reached the governors' desks the same day, and each called in to find out if the other signed. I was confronted with my first crisis. But, with Solomon-like wisdom, I solved the entire matter very quickly. I simply arranged for the two governors to sign simultaneously as they talked together by telephone.

I should point out that what started simply as a way of getting two governors off my back turned into a top-notch publicity gimmick. Stories—and even pictures about the joint signing—made papers all over the country.

Last week, when the steering committee met again—this time in Santa Fe, New Mexico—20 states had joined the Compact. And today, as I address you here, 23 states have joined.

We are confident that by the time the full Commission holds its first official meeting in Chicago next June, more than a majority of the 54 states and territories will be members.

The states, other than the first 10 I mentioned earlier, which have now joined are Oregon, Ohio, Idaho, Wyoming, Washington, Vermont, West Virginia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Alaska, Maryland, and South Carolina. There is good representation from every geographical part of the United States—New England, the East Coast, the South, the Middle West, the Mountain States, the Southwest, and the Far West.

I should also point out that it is now only a year and a half since Dr. Conant published his idea for the Compact. The idea has developed with remarkable speed. I attribute this to two things: (a) the effort which Governor Sanford has put forth, and (b) the interest and general acceptance of the idea by the vast majority of political and educational leaders in America.

This very speed, however, has scared some people. Frankly, most educators, especially many in higher education, are not used to moving so rapidly. This speed has brought distrust in some camps. But this distrust is rapidly being dispelled as the organization develops.

Perhaps the chief thing which has scared some university and college presidents is the fear that they might lose some of their long- and hard-fought-for independence from political maneuverings into academic freedom, curriculum content, and so forth. They fear that their long-established declaration of independence from politics might be shattered by the declaration of interdependence which the educators and politicians pledged at Kansas City. These fears are groundless.

The Compact for Education will have no policy-making authority. It does not want any. If it had such authority, it would defeat its own purposes. The Compact is being designed not to dictate policy, but to suggest alternative solutions to pressing problems shared by all the states. With many of these problems, there may not be any one best way for each state—with its own peculiar financial and population problems — to solve them. Some ways will be better than others. And our job will be to list those best solutions.

Let us be specific for a moment. When the steering committee met last week, it voted to recommend that the full commission initiate five studies at its June meeting. One of the first problems we plan to study will be how the states should establish or expand systems of community or junior colleges. There already seems to be general agreement across the land that every citizen should have the opportunity to go to school through the fourteenth grade if he so desires, just as he once did only through the eighth, and then through the twelfth grade.

California's 76 junior colleges are set up so that each one offers both academic and vocational work. Graduates then transfer to either a state college, a university campus, or a private school if they decide they want to continue their work. Indiana's junior colleges are part of the university system. Other states offer still other methods and systems.

The Compact will look at every state and territory, study what each one is doing, and make alternative recommendations to the member states as a whole. For instance, the recommendations may say that generally a university-connected junior college system is the best for all states, or only for large states. Or, it may offer other recommendations for states with less than two million population or less than a certain per-capita wealth.

What each state does about those recommendations, however, will be entirely up to the individual state itself. Even if it rejects the recommendations that are designed for it, the state will certainly have benefitted to some degree by having the thinking of those experts who researched the problem and by knowing immediately what each state has done to solve its problem in this area.

Another of the five problems the steering committee selected to recommend for study is financing elementary and secondary education. This study was chosen because the steering committee realized that the level of effort by the states varies tremendously. Some states provide over 70 percent of the total funds for education in the state, while in others, the local governments provide the largest share. The committee knew, also, that while the federal government is doing more now than ever before, it is inevitable that this participation in public education will increase. All of these factors, therefore, pointed to a need for an extensive look at school finance.

So, the steering committee recommended to the full commission that it institute a project to study the various methods used by states to finance education and to determine the effectiveness of these methods as they apply to the variety of problems and conditions peculiar to a state.

The committee also recommended that the study include a recommendation about alternative methods by which states of various sizes, population, and wealth can best provide financial support for elementary and secondary education.

The study will include an examination of the variety of federal financing programs such as the Heller Plan, state tax credit, and others.

The Compact hopes to be more than an information office, offering the states facts and figures on what each state is doing in any given area. It hopes to be more than a consultant to the states by making recommendations on how to do their jobs better. It also hopes to serve as a strong voice of the states upward to the federal government — to help tell the federal government what type of federal aid to education the states want, and how they want it administered.

Right now, there are more than 50 voices. We hope to represent the united voices of the states. Such a consensus is being actively sought by the federal government. The federal government also wants nothing more than to see the states themselves take a more active leadership role in education.

I am sure many of you read on October 15, 1965, what Francis Keppel, at the time U.S. Commissioner of Education, said in a speech in Detroit:

> In the long run nothing that we in education can do, whether in Washington or anywhere else, can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time. In education we look to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity. In this Nation of 50 states with vast and independent enterprises for education, the Federal Government can help as a partner, but only as a partner—and a somewhat junior partner at that.

We look to the federal government as a junior partner in education, a partner in shaping a new and better nationwide educational policy.

To strengthen the capacity of the states to meet the needs of our time in education, there just had to be something like the Compact for Education. I have already made it clear that a single policy of education is not desirable in this country. I have tried to make it equally clear, however, that unconnected state and local efforts represent the other extreme, and they, too, are not desirable.

The Compact is the happy medium. It will study problems. It will recommend alternate solutions to those problems. The states will have the benefit of the Compact's advice and recommendations, but the final policy decision on any given subject will be left to the individual state to make.

The educational policies of one state are no longer a matter of concern to that state alone. They are increasingly of concern to every other state. The United States has a mobile population. The U.S. Census of 1960 showed that, in that year, almost 12 percent of the population lived in a state other than the one they had lived in five years previously. Furthermore, Bureau of Labor Statistics studies show that unemployed workers have an even higher mobility than those who are employed.

From this, it becomes clear that the educational practice of one state affects all others. Every state must know what is going on in the educational establishments of every other state, what policies are being proposed, what various educational innovations are being tried, and which are successful.

It is senseless for a child to move from one state to another, only to find he has to be moved back a grade, or take the work he had last year over again, simply because he crossed a state line.

Therefore, the Compact is highly acceptable to all of the states. The less progressive states want membership so that their standard can be raised. The more progressive states want membership so that the new students who move into their states will be of a higher quality.

The Compact will serve as a forum for discussion. You cannot imagine how impressive it is to hear educators, legislators, and governors seated around the same table discussing their common problems in education.

It will serve as a mechanism for research not now carried on, a clearinghouse for information, a communication device to the federal government.

It will not be a policy-maker. It will not start a drive toward uniformity in American education though it will attempt to set nationwide minimum standards. It will not attack or curtail federal aid to education or federal activity. It will not compete with, replace, or make obsolete the current voluntary associations or national and regional organizations in education.

It started as an idea, an idea by the foremost critic in American education today, James Bryant Conant. That idea was developed by the man who has become known as the education governor of the United States, Terry Sanford. It was first financed by a foundation which had as its director a man who constantly searches for ideas, John Gardner, a man who today is Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and is still searching for ideas.

Last week, as Dr. Conant watched, the steering committee chose its first executive director, Wendell Pierce, Superintendent of the Cincinnati Public Schools, and a man who is known for his search for new ideas to solve old problems.

The Compact has had an illustrious beginning. I sincerely believe that this new partnership between the educational and political forces of the states will, by continuing to search for new ideas, find answers for the many educational problems of today which must be solved.

Promoting a Better Understanding of Education

Loyd L. Turner

Your conference theme reminds me that last summer I attended an invitational conference in Denver sponsored by the National School Boards Association which, among other things, arrived at this terse consensus: Education is a local function, a state responsibility, and a federal concern.

My subject is "Toward a Better Understanding of Education." The best way to get there from here is through public relations and communication. Why? Because communication leads to understanding. And understanding leads to broader public support, and broader support leads to progress in education.

I would like to make quite clear that I consider public relations and communication no less important in education than in industry. As a matter of fact, public relations is probably more important in education because progress in public education is so directly related to public opinion.

Fortunately, more and more educators are beginning to realize this and are beginning to do something about it. So are governors. The governor of Texas, for instance, early this year named a 15-member Committee on Public School Education to conduct a three-year "pervasive inquiry into every facet of Texas public elementary and secondary education."

The days are about gone—and it's high time—when school boards and school superintendents could get away with telling the public only what they thought the public ought to know. *The schools belong to the public—not to the school board and not to the superintendent—and the public has a right to know what is happening in them.*

The schools cannot move any faster than public opinion will permit; so an informed public is a prerequisite to progress. If, as a board member, you try to lead too fast, you will not be re-elected. If, as a superintendent, you try to lead too fast, you will be fired.

Changes come slowly in public education, perhaps too slowly, but good boards of education and good superintendents can help to accelerate this rate of change.

Most of the 137,000 school-board members in the United States, like most of the 2,000,000 teachers, are good, a few are bad, and some are indifferent. Theirs is a great responsibility, for they deal with a parent's most precious possessions, his children and his pocketbook.

Mr. Turner is Assistant to the President of the Fort Worth Division of General Dynamics and President of the Fort Worth Board of Education.

Chicago, or Fort Worth, or Anywhere, U.S.A., can have just as good a school system as it wants—*and not one bit better.*

Some of my friends wonder why I read so much about education, and why I regularly attend the state and national conventions of school administrators and school-board members. The answer is simply that I, and an increasing number of school-board members, believe that one of the functions of a school board is leadership, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to lead without being informed. A good school board will lead the public in demanding higher educational levels in its district and state. Board members have as much responsibility as anybody—and more responsibility than most people—for building broader support, fuller understanding, and deeper commitment to education.

I do not say this because I should, but because I believe it. If it had not been for education, I would have had to go back to the farm after World War II. That would not have been easy, because there were not many farms left, and I did not come from a farm in the first place.

I did attend high school in a small town in the midst of the depression—which my daughter considers a myth. I have told her how tough it was in those days (the early 1930's), and how I had to walk to school hip-deep through the snow. Do you know what she said to me recently? "Dad, the older you get, the farther you lived from school, and the deeper the snow drifts get."

You know, as well as I, that public interest in education has increased tremendously in recent years. This has resulted in a lot of criticism of public education, some enlightened and some not so enlightened. In the years ahead, there is going to be more interest in, criticism of, and controversy surrounding education than many educators would like. But they have little choice if they stay in the profession. It is like the inveterate poker player, who knew the game was crooked, but it was the only game in town.

This is not a time for educators with their feet in the past, their hands on the *status quo,* and their eyes on retirement. Neither is it a time for educators more interested in avoiding controversy than in providing an up-to-date education for the boys and girls in their state and their school district.

I shall not insult your intelligence by attempting a one-sentence definition of what school public relations *is,* but I shall tell you what it *does.* It seeks to bring about a harmony of understanding between the school and the public it serves *and upon whose good will it depends.* This calls for a two-way flow of ideas between school and community. School public relations should be a systematic, continuing series of activities for educating people in a community on the purposes of the school—its programs, its accomplishments, and its problems.

Purely as background to my remarks, I should tell you that the Fort Worth Independent School District has an annual budget of about $30 million, covers 180 square miles, employs 4,700 people, and enrolls 77,000 pupils in 114 schools.

We do not have the answers to all of the public relations problems in education, and we do not claim to. If any of you know of a handy-dandy do-it-yourself kit for handling public relations, I should like to buy one. In fact, I should like to obtain the Southwest distributorship.

I shall not bore you by reciting all of the things which we do on the public relations front in Fort Worth to promote a better understanding of education, but I should like to mention two or three.

Our board meetings are always open and are always covered by the press. All official actions of the board are taken in public. Open meetings encourage trust and stimulate confidence in the school system.

We devote quite a bit of time, effort, and money to the preparation and distribution of an eight-page monthly publication called the *Superintendent's Journal,* because it is the single most important communication with all of our employees.

We also devote time and effort each year to promoting Public School Week as part of the state-wide effort to get citizens into the public schools to see firsthand what is going on. We have led the state in number of visitors 15 times in the 16 years that the week has been observed. During this week we distribute 60,000 special full-color brochures telling the school story.

It is hard to measure the results of these and other public relations activities, because public relations is largely an intangible. But I can cite you one very tangible result. Our most recent bond election, calling for the issuance of $27.2 million in bonds to build 17 air-conditioned schools passed by a 7-to-1 ratio at a time when many school bond elections around the nation were being shot down at the polls.

In public schools as in industry, public relations should begin at home. The employees of the school system—the principals, the teachers, the secretaries, the custodians, and all the rest—are the school system's most important public. A close second are the pupils, followed by the parents, and then taxpayers in general. (You know what taxpayers are—they work for the government but do not have to take a civil service exam.)

Teachers, in my opinion, are the most important single factor in good school-community relations, regardless of whether they realize it or whether their principals ever told them so. Without them, it would be difficult to achieve a better understanding of education. When public relations in a school system rests on a foundation of sound classroom accomplishment, it is like a house built on a rock. Storms of ill-founded criticism will not overwhelm it.

Teachers have access to the most direct line of communication—*pupils.* Teachers are not teachers by day and public relations agents by night. They are necessarily both at the same time.

I am just enough of an optimist to believe that many teachers are beginning to carry their share of the public relations load. (I am not as overly optimistic, though, as the remark attributed to General Custer: "Men, let's not take any prisoners.")

More and more teachers are realizing that today's pupils are tomorrow's taxpayers, PTA leaders, legislators, school-board members, or other influential persons in the community and state. Schools that serve these pupils well can depend on their continued loyalty and support.

The knowledge explosion, coupled with the population explosion, will require more teachers and better teachers. They will have to teach better and they will have to teach more. Obviously, we shall have to pay teachers more in order to attract and keep them. Good teachers, probably more than good school boards, make good schools, although it is hard to imagine one without the other.

Mention of the knowledge explosion brings to mind the major changes now taking place in public education. We cannot achieve—and we certainly cannot help others to achieve—a better understanding of education unless we take note of these changes.

1. *One of the biggest changes of all is the knowledge explosion.* Nowhere is this explosion dramatized better than in *Schools for the Sixties,* a National Education Association report, which many of you have probably read. This report proposes that if the accelerating growth in knowledge be plotted against a time line ranging from the birth of Christ to the present, "the first doubling of knowledge occurred in 1750, the second in 1900, the third in 1950, and the fourth only ten years later, 1960"[1]

Another indicator of this knowledge explosion is the fact that 90 percent of the scientists who ever lived are alive today. Here is a further indication: 75 percent of the people working in industry 10 years from now will be making products not yet invented or discovered.

2. *The federal government will get more and more involved in education.* Even those who dislike the idea—and their name is legion—may resignedly come to the conclusion that when federal aid is inevitable, they should relax and enjoy it. Local school boards conceivably could be flattened beneath a federally financed steamroller, making local control of schools the "myth" which some professional educators and others wish it were.

Federal financial support of education is older than the Constitution—which, interestingly enough, does not mention education. But federal financial support of education in the past has been modest. It is now becoming massive.

The role of the federal government in public education has increased more than 20-fold since World War II. There are at least 40 federal agencies directly or indirectly involved in financing education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 represents the greatest single commitment ever made by the federal government for the improvement of education.

Federal aid to education is not an issue—it is a fact. Federal aid to education is here—by the billions—regardless of whether you like it or I like it.

3. *The areas of education that will receive the most emphasis in the next five years are preschool education, vocational and technical training, and adult education.*

In re preschool education: Recent research indicates that intelligence is more susceptible to development than was formerly supposed, if the development is started early enough. You know about the Yale professor's success in teaching three-year-olds to read.

In re vocational and technical training: Fifty years ago common laborers outnumbered professional workers 3 to 1; today that ratio has been reversed.

High schools, which traditionally have been oriented toward the college-bound, must do a better job of educating the non-college-bound, equipping them with marketable skills. We hope the stigma attached to vocational education will gradually disappear. If so, the ugly duckling, vocational education, may well become a white swan before this century ends.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, put the problem this way:

---

[1] National Education Association, Project on Instruction. *Schools for the Sixties.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963. p. 50.

> The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.[2]

In re adult education: There are over 16,000,000 elderly persons in the United States who are retiring earlier and living longer than their forebears. (Every 20 seconds some American reaches age 65.) Another reason for the upsurge in adult education is our shorter working day, resulting in increased time for leisure. There are 8,000,000 "functional" illiterates in the United States; one-half of all adult Americans have not finished high school; and one million more young people are dropping out—or being pushed out—each year.

4. *The number of school districts will decrease, and the number of community (junior) colleges will increase.* More and more small school districts, in my opinion, will grudgingly admit that they cannot provide a first-class education for their children, and this will lead to mergers. Local boards should provide leadership for their communities so that decisions on school district structure will be based on education, excellence, and efficiency rather than on economy, politics, or expediency.

There are more than 700 community colleges in the country today, and I expect the number to double in my lifetime.

California leads the nation in two-year colleges, but many other states, notably Florida and Texas, are rapidly increasing the number of their junior colleges. Florida's goal is to have a junior college within commuting distance of every citizen, and it is not far from that goal. There are 31 public junior colleges in Texas, and several more are under construction, including multi-campus two-year colleges in Dallas and Fort Worth.

5. *The population explosion and population mobility will create major problems for public education.* Some people think of the population explosion as China's problem or India's problem, but it is also a problem in the United States. A case in point is the formation a year ago of a Population Crisis Committee, a private group headed by a former senator.

It is not just a problem of too many people; it is also a problem of too many people in certain age groups and in particular places.

Since 1945 the United States has added to its population as many persons (54,000,000) as now live in the United Kingdom. Nearly all of this growth has been in the suburbs. By the year 2,000, there will be nearly 400,000,000 Americans, and 80 percent of them will live in cities.

A current news magazine estimates that within 35 years the United States will have to build as many urban homes, highways, and facilities (including schools) as it has built since the Pilgrims landed.

Twenty percent of American families move every year. (If you have not moved in the last five years, you have missed your turn.) Family stability arising out of long residence in one town or city is about gone. Under these conditions it is difficult for people to develop a community feeling or a deep interest in their public schools.

The family is no longer the simple, primary group it used to be. An intergenerational conflict is taking place between adults and children, and it is widening, with various implications for the public schools.

---

[2] Gardner, John W. "Quality in Higher Education." *NEA Journal* 47: 364; September 1958.

There are numerous other changes taking place which will affect public education; for instance, the civil rights movement, teachers' efforts to participate to some degree in decision-making, and continued acceleration in technology and automation. This bare mention must suffice today because of time limitations; but this is by no means indicative of the attention which these changes will receive in the years ahead.

Meanwhile, back in the classroom, as the pace of change quickens, as technology becomes more specialized, as advertising and propaganda become more subtle, and as international problems become more intricate, the schools will need to give more attention to developing in their students the competence to understand and to deal with such complexities. And educators will need to give more attention to explaining to the public why this is so and why this is necessary.

Finding answers to these problems and staying abreast of these changes will keep all of us busy in the weeks and months and years ahead. I hope, however, that all of us will find some time to promote among the general public a better understanding of education and an even greater desire for it. If we need an incentive—which is unlikely—let us remember H. G. Wells' statement in his *Outline of History:* "Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe."

State Action for Increased School Support—Role of the State Department

William D. Firman

THOSE OF US who work in the New York State Education Department greet the NEA publication, *The Rankings of the States,* each spring with increasingly mixed emotions. While the annual ranking of New York as number one in expenditure level brings a glow of civic and professional pride as well as a sense of expanding accomplishment, it also brings an assurance that the telephone will soon be ringing and that the mail will be flooded with inquiries. Similarly, we have learned that associations of taxpayers will be demanding reductions in expenditures while those who defend the educational budget in the halls of the legislature will be seeking objective evidence that increasing expenditures will result in better quality education.

Obviously, while caution is advised in an interpretation of rankings based upon 50 diversified state accounting systems, it is probable that a refinement of the statistics would still place New York at or near the top of the list. Moreover, this is not a new phenomenon. New York does spend more money for the education of every child than does any other state and it has been doing so for decades.

That this is true, however, does not make our citizens, or governor, or legislators, or educators less sensitive to the statistic. In contrast, it increases sensitivity and places an undeniable demand upon educational leadership to produce the "best" in education with economy and efficiency. In the same way, it has stimulated the development of a comprehensive research and evaluation effort in the State Education Department, a program designed to improve the objectivity of the decision-making function. It is not by accident, for example, that New York has pioneered in such programs as the Quality Measurement Project, Cost-Quality Studies, State-Aided Experimental Programs, Program Budgeting, the Center on Innovation, School Program Evaluation, Cooperative Review Service, Departmental Programs Evaluation, and the like. It was not a "make-work" project when we compared the expenditure patterns of schools in New York with those of other states having similar characteristics or when we compared the patterns of high-expenditure with low-expenditure schools in our state. The Avis claim that when you are *second best,* you try harder is not

---

Dr. Firman is Director of the Division of Evaluation of the University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Albany, New York.

applicable to the New York State Education Department in its search for quality with efficiency and economy.

Support Increased Through Political Action

While the Department itself is frequently the focus of public attention in defending the magnitude of expenditures or other related concerns, it is not the Department which determines state fiscal policy. Nor does the Department play a major role of direction or participation in the multiplicity of politically oriented activities which frequently precede changes in the school finance laws. This important business of crystallizing the details of a generally acceptable legislative program through discussion and compromise, as well as the equally important task of winning public support for legislative and executive action, is left to the power structure represented in such organizations as the Educational Conference Board, the Council of School Superintendents, the Association of School District Administrators, the Teachers Association, the PTA, the Citizens Committee for the Public Schools, the Public Education Association and the Elementary and Secondary School Principals Association. It is important to note at this point, too, that much of the credit for New York's leadership in school support goes to a succession of legislators and governors who themselves have been convinced of the importance of good education.

This is not to say that the Department does not have its own legislative program, for it most assuredly does. The development of this program begins on the day that the preceding legislative session ends. It is based upon a continuous process of data collection, analysis, discussion, and reporting. It attains fruition in the form of a statement by the Board of Regents, transmitted to the governor and the legislature. It is translated into specifics by the introduction of departmentally sponsored bills.

The Role of the Education Department

The importance which is attached to the Department's role in improving school quality through finance and management services is recognized at the cabinet level of departmental administration. Here an Associate Commissioner for Educational Finance and Management Services with four other associate commissioners meet with the Commissioner and his Deputy to formulate and implement all Department policies and programs. Clearly, school fiscal support is high on the list of priorities.

This Associate Commissioner with an assistant commissioner, three directors of divisions, two assistant directors and a bureau chief together with a staff of specialists have responsibility for such activities as:

1. Advising and assisting educational institutions with efficient and economical management of their financial and business affairs
2. Advising and assisting educational institutions with building planning as well as the review and approval of building plans
3. Planning, administering, and evaluating state aid programs
4. Planning and administering federal aid programs, including the supervision of school lunch programs and the distribution of federally donated foods
5. Procuring and distributing federal surplus property
6. Designing and conducting basic research studies on conditions, needs, and problems in educational finance.

It may be observed from this generalized description of departmental organization that all activities relating to educational fiscal problems are the responsibility of a single coordinated administrative structure. It is also to be noted that the areas of responsibility include the functions of planning, approving, apportioning, and evaluating the use of all state and federal educational funds.

With this rather general, inadequate description of a truly comprehensive plan, program, and administrative structure, one which serves its purposes admirably, I would like to focus your particular attention upon the Bureau of Educational Finance Research. It is this unit which, as a part of the Division of Educational Finance, has responsibility for designing and conducting basic research studies on the conditions, needs, and problems in educational finance. A description of its activities and the procedures which it employs to serve its purposes reflect the Department's role in fostering adequate school support.

The Bureau of Educational Finance Research

The creation of this unit in the departmental structure, approximately 10 years ago, was part of an innovative design to improve school resource utilization through qualitative as well as quantitative types of analyses. Furthermore, the new perspective was to be from the broad fields of economics and public finance rather than from the narrow field of school finance alone. These changes in structure and perspective have demonstrated their value in several significant ways:

1. School finance research has become a comprehensive, well-planned, full-time, year-round activity rather than a sporadic, ill-conceived, noncomprehensive response to an immediate problem or a legislative request.

2. It has become more than the simple counting and reporting of pupils, dollars, tax rates, expenditures, and the like. It now has a qualitative as well as a quantitative dimension.

3. The Bureau has earned the confidence of all of its clients: the Executive Office, the Legislature, the Budget Office, the Comptroller's Office, and all of the professional associations which request data, analyses, or consultation. The responses which are made, with the help of computers, are immediate, accurate, and complete.

4. It has led to the development, understanding, and general use of *principles* in the assessment of proposals for changes in school finance laws. Increasingly, the criteria of adequacy, adaptability, flexibility, control, equity, predictability, administrability, and balanced judgment are being understood and applied.

5. A yearly evaluation of the fiscal "health" of all of the school districts of the state provides immediate and objective evidence of the strength of the system and/or of the need for changes.

The Bureau is staffed by an Administrator with specialized training and experience, a state aid analyst, a senior economist, and an economist. Consultants are also employed temporarily for special studies or projects.

Typically, in addition to the specialized informational and consultative services which the unit provides, it publishes a myriad of reports, the titles of which describe the scope and depth of research activity:

State Aid to New York State School Districts, 1964-65

A Public School Finance Program To

Meet Emerging Educational Problems—1965

Balancing Public School Needs for the Fiscal Support Program—1964

Boards of Cooperative Educational Services—1964

Education for the Sixties—How Much Will it Cost—1961

A Series of Guides to State Aid Programs in Support of Education

A Guide to Federal Programs Operated by New York State Educational Agencies

Fundamental Structure of Educational Finance Problems in New York State

The Effects of the 1962 State Aid Legislation

Fiscal Independence of School Systems

Adult Education—The Relationship of Program Development to State Fiscal Policy

Why People Vote "No"

Toward a System of Classification of School Districts in New York State

Similarly, some of the special studies that have been undertaken are:

Encouraging School District Reorganization Through a Modification of Fiscal Policy

An Analysis of Transportation Aid in New York State

Educational Expenditures in High Expenditure Districts and Low Expenditure Districts in New York State

An Analysis of Fiscal Conditions Found in Rapidly Growing Districts

The Effect of Sparsity upon Public School Staffing and Expenditures

A Comparison of Educational Expenditures in New York State with Those of Other States Having Similar Characteristics

An Analysis of the Fiscal Condition of the Big Six City School Districts

In addition to the publication of reports, the basic data are converted frequently to multi-colored visuals in graphic form for use in departmental conferences, seminars with legislators, and other activities of an informational nature.

Most of the persons who are currently responsible for this program are in attendance at this conference: Dr. John Polley, Director of the Division of Finance; Dr. Michael Capuano, Assistant Director for State Aided Programs; Mr. Charles Quinn, Assistant Director for Federal Aid Programs; Mr. Lloyd Hogan, Chief, Bureau of Educational Finance Research; and Mr. James Vetro, State Aid Analyst.

I point this out to you now so that if you have further questions about the program, or are interested in some of the publications you can direct your questions or request to them.

In summary, it has been said here that the State Department's role in improving school support can be a powerful one; supportive, but not political. The impact of the role has been strengthened through an administrative arrangement which provides a continuous flow of meaningful data professionally analyzed, evaluated, and competently reported.

State Action for Increased School Support—Role of the State Education Association

Elmer S. Crowley

IN 1965 THE IDAHO Legislature approved one of the most dramatic increases for the financing of the public schools in the history of the state—and enacted a 3-percent sales tax to support its action. This legislative session boosted the public-school appropriation by 42 percent over the previous biennium, nearly tripled cumulative sick leave, established permanent bonding limits for the school districts, and came to grips with the problem of tax revision, including the enactment of a sales tax. It will go down in history as one of the most productive sessions in the state. *But behind this story is the carefully coordinated action program of the Idaho Education Association which was a major factor in creating the climate for a dramatic breakthrough in the financing of public education.*

Conservative State

To fully appreciate what was accomplished, you must know that Idaho is a conservative state with a vast geographical area (65 percent of which is owned by the federal government), a relatively small population, and limited resources. It is also a paradox. For many years Idaho has paid the lowest average salaries in the West and has spent the least per child in ADA of the 11 Western states, and yet it ranks second among the 50 states in literacy, fifth in the number of school children per 100 adults, and eighth in the median years of schooling completed by its population 25 years of age and older.

Prelude to Mediocrity

In 1963 the nation learned of conditions in our neighboring state of Utah because teachers there were unitedly militant and sanctions were invoked on the state and national levels. Had the teachers of our state been ready to follow the same course of action in 1963, Idaho would have shared national headlines with her sister state because conditions in Idaho were far more deplorable than they were in Utah.

For several years Idaho had been falling steadily behind the 10 other Western states in average salaries of teachers and in the amount spent per child. In 1963 the NEA Research Division's *Rankings of the States* pegged

---

Mr. Crowley is Administrative Director of the National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers Associations, Washington, D. C., and Former Executive Secretary of the Idaho Education Association.

Idaho forty-fourth among the 50 states in the percentage of increase in expenditure per child in ADA during the previous decade. By 1965 the state had plummeted to the bottom.

The governor claimed state appropriations had increased 300 percent during the decade, and he failed to see how our state could be last. The answer was simple. Idaho had not been keeping pace with other states. Needless to say, the pride of many citizens was piqued by this view from the bottom.

Teacher morale was low and yet the profession lacked unity. Within its ranks was a mixture of apathy, militancy, dedication, and frustration. Unrest in certain portions of the state was aggravated by the action in Utah where substantial gains made Idaho's situation look even worse.

In fairness, I must say that our 1963 session enacted some good educational legislation, including the recodification of Idaho's school laws, but *it lacked the political courage and leadership to meet the issue of tax revision and adequate financial support for the public schools.* The governor bowed to political expediency, and, in his message to the legislature, recommended an appropriation $3 million short of the actual amount needed to maintain *status quo* during the ensuing biennium. The legislature made a token increase, and exceeded the *minimum* by $1 million, but shortly after it adjourned, the governor ordered a cut-back of 4.8 percent in the apportionments to major state agencies, including the public schools. This action was taken when it became apparent that state revenue measures would be inadequate to meet the appropriations. The result was a $2 million reduction in authorized state funds for elementary and secondary education. The amount was made up to the school districts by a compensating levy on local property, but nevertheless state support was reduced by approximately $2 million while the tax burden at the local level was increased. The president of the Idaho School Trustees Association solemnly observed that "never was so little waited for so long by so many."

Constructive Course

Even before the legislature adjourned, conditions had reached crisis proportions and hundreds of teachers were clamoring for militant action, but such a course was ruled out because it lacked the support of a substantial majority of teachers. They were frustrated but not yet ready to take this step.

The Association faced the dilemma of a divided membership and the necessity for developing a course of action which would unite its members and at the same time create public opinion strong enough to demand a breakthrough for increased state support for education.

A number of measures were adopted to bring order out of chaos and bridge the gap between legislative sessions, but that chapter must remain untold since my assignment is to focus on the campaign which helped establish a climate for the breakthrough of 1965.

The Plan

The first step in our over-all plan called for a study of the public schools in Idaho; the second was the adoption of a seven-point program designed to (a) involve the members, (b) create a ground swell of public opinion and (c) avoid a Utah-type crisis, if at all possible.

1. *Study of Idaho's public schools*—For over a year and a half the Idaho Education Association had petitioned the governor to appoint a blue-ribbon

committee to study conditions of the public schools in Idaho, but the plea fell on deaf ears. The governor was not interested. However, when our case was presented to Dr. Carr and the National Commission on Professional Rights and Responsibilities, the NEA responded to our request and, in cooperation with our state association, jointly set up an 18-member study committee which completed its work in time to lay an advance copy of the report on the desk of every member of the 1965 Legislature. The press heralded the study as a prelude to a sanction, and it may well have been, had the 1965 Legislature duplicated the miserable performance of 1963. Findings of the study teams were pretty dismal, and the Report was a contributing factor in the 1965 breakthrough.

2. *The seven-point program*—In addition to the study, the Delegate Assembly approved a seven-point program, every point of which demanded an investment of time and funds on the part of Association members. The plan had widespread appeal because it was specific and workable. Furthermore, it contained a safety valve to deal with the situation in the event no ground swell of public opinion was forthcoming. In launching the seven-point program we announced our intention of avoiding a Utah-type crisis, but some of our more vocal citizens were suspicious. Several newspapers screamed that our stated intention was nothing more than a thinly veiled threat. One paper declared that this kind of implied coercion was of no service to the teachers or to education. Nevertheless, we pressed forward with a vigorous and successful campaign.

Briefly here are the seven points:

1. *Legislative Action Committee*—An eight-member Legislative Action Committee representing the geographical regions of the state was to be appointed to (a) spearhead a public information drive and enlist support for the legislative program, (b) work with IEA leaders in promoting legislation, and (c) recommend a course of action in the event the legislature failed to provide adequately for the public schools.

2. *Flying squadron* — A "flying squadron" composed of representatives of the School Trustees Association, the PTA, and the IEA was to be assembled. With the cooperation of the Legislative Action Committee the "flying squadron" was to conduct area meetings with key groups throughout the state to acquaint the public with the needs of education and the legislative program. The squadron was not expected to fly, but to move quickly from community to community armed with facts and information.

3. *Political action*—A more vigorous execution of the Association's political action program was recommended. This included (a) analyzing the voting record of incumbents, (b) holding area meetings to interview prospective candidates for the legislature and to determine their specific views on education, (c) getting-out-the-vote campaign, and (d) member endorsement and support of candidates who were highly favorable toward better education and substantially increased state support for the public schools. (The IEA as an organization was not to endorse or support candidates.)

4. *Public relations expert* — The services of a qualified public relations expert were to be secured to help the Association plan an all-out information program through the communications media and to develop strategy.

5. *Public information materials*—Special materials were to be prepared,

pointing up the needs and problems of Idaho's public schools.

6. *Public opinion poll*—At the appropriate time a public opinion poll was to be conducted by a reputable firm to determine public reaction toward the IEA and sentiment concerning more adequate school support.

7. *Public information fund*—Finally, a special public information fund was to be created through a $5 voluntary contribution from each member of the Association. The purpose of the fund was to finance projects related to the seven-point program.

Goals Established

The major legislative goals for 1965 included (a) an increase of $100 per child from state funds, and (b) tax revision, including the enactment of a 3-percent sales tax to help provide the necessary revenue.

Implementation

Someone has aptly said that the world is made up of willing people—some are willing to work and the others are willing to let them. But the seven-point program on which our campaign hinged was intended to involve every member of the Association and extend into every community within the state. It gave teachers an opportunity to stand up and be counted, to be part of the answer or part of the problem, and the public was to be deluged with an unprecedented flood of information about their schools.

1. *Public relations expert hired*—Our first official act was to hire a public relations counselor who worked with us nearly six months, helping implement our seven-point program.

With the help of our public relations expert we launched a public information campaign involving the news media well in advance of the 1965 Legislative session. For 11 months we averaged one good crisp news release every week. These releases were sent to the major wire services, TV and radio stations, and to every one of the 100 newspapers in the state, both weekly and daily. The response was gratifying. With few exceptions the articles were given good play in the leading newspapers. Editors who, for one reason or another, did not publish them at least were kept up to date on the facts about education.

We know that public relations is far more than publicity, and under normal conditions a continuous flood of articles would be unnecessary, but owing to the critical situation this direct flow of news was essential. The articles helped give visibility to the Association and served as a channel for vital information.

In the main, the success of this phase of our program depended on brief, carefully written articles with a single point.

2. *Campaign symbol adopted*—Our next major project was to choose a symbol which would have a direct relationship to our campaign and could be worn on the coat lapel or blouse of each member. A common steel safety pin was selected because it was simple, inexpensive, and symbolic. It symbolized our intent to *pin down* the facts about Idaho education and it reminded people of the condition of Idaho's financial structure which we maintained was literally *pinned* together.

The pin project, which was launched before the closing of school in the spring, stirred up a tremendous reaction among educators and the public alike. Many thought the pin was a good idea and labeled it "clever." Others resented it. Newspaper editorials were even written pro and con.

One editorial writer ridiculed it as "the latest stunt" of the IEA to disclose the poverty of the Gem State public schools, their facilities, and low teachers' salaries, and suggested that something more intellectual might touch off the campaign for better school support such as an orderly thought-provoking program on education.

The editor of a neighboring newspaper, summing up the purpose of the pin, said, "Phooey to the critics and more power to the IEA." He declared: "We hope that the safety pin gimmick works and that it helps keep the issue directly in the forefront of the minds of our concerned citizens. Indeed, let us pin down the facts about Idaho education," he said, "then let's do something about it. If the safety pin thing will help, we say use it for all it's worth. And if it doesn't work as intended, let's bend the pointed portion of it a little farther south and use it to another advantage."

It did work, and although some teachers refused to wear it because they considered it to be undignified, it became the focal point of our campaign. Whenever it was seen or discussed, either pro or con, it stirred up a discussion on the financial needs of education. The pin opened the way for educators to explain the problems of the public schools. Small cards, listing four reasons why the pin was being worn, were printed and distributed to teachers. These proved helpful when curious citizens asked: "Why the pin?"

Even our most severe newspaper critics, in ridiculing the pin, found space in the same editorial column to recognize that the schools were in trouble, and so the problems were constantly before the public.

Incidentally, the safety pin is not a new device. It has a long and colorful history. It was the symbol of the suffrage movement in America. It was used to demonstrate the unity of American women in their determination to win the right to vote. There is ample evidence that the safety pin was also used for identification purposes during World War II by the anti-Nazi underground.

It took some salesmanship, but the pin caught on, and was publicized far beyond the borders of our state. It was reported in the news and newscasts as far west as Los Angeles and east to Delaware. In Idaho it was rated by the United Press as fourth among the top 10 stories of the year. The pin served its purpose well and Idaho citizens got the point—painlessly!

3. *Legislative Action Committee*—The Legislative Action Committee was appointed with a representative from each of the geographical districts of the IEA. It met regularly between September and March, and functioned as a liaison between the state association and teachers in the respective districts. Members felt good because of the responsibilities assigned to the committee and because every area of the state was represented.

4. *Political action*—With greater emphasis on citizenship activities, more teachers became involved in politics. They interviewed candidates, urged their colleagues to get out the vote, and made follow-up contacts with legislators. Those who participated in these activities enjoyed the direct communication with their senators and representatives. On the other hand, candidates and legislators developed a new awareness of educators.

5. *Publications*—Public information materials were printed and given widespread distribution. Among them was the 1965 edition of the Facts booklet entitled *Let's Pin Down the Facts*

About Idaho's Public Schools. It provided statistics and outlined the needs in popular cartoon form. A speaker's manual, with supporting data, was prepared as a supplement for those making public presentations.

Education packets for *The Busy Idaho Legislator* were specially designed and personally distributed to every one of the 44 senators and 79 representatives. The same materials, placed in packets labeled *Information for Community Leaders,* were sent to key individuals throughout the state. Eleven different research leaflets included in the packets were available in quantity.

A new milestone was reached when we commercially produced our first color motion picture entitled *The Idaho School Dilemma* and booked it for showings before thousands of Idaho citizens. It was filmed on the playgrounds and in the classrooms of the state.

6. *Public opinion poll*—Our public opinion poll turned out to be too expensive, so we settled for a telephone survey in which over 750 teachers asked approximately 3,000 citizens their opinions about taxes and the public schools. The project had the twin effects of involving both the public and members of the profession.

7. *Flying squadrons* — Meantime, the flying squadron hatched into 25 squadrons composed of representatives of the PTA, the school boards, and the IEA. The state association conducted orientation sessions for squadron leaders before they spread out over Idaho to hold meetings in local communities where they explained the problems and needs of the public schools.

The original plan for one state-wide squadron was abandoned in favor of multiple teams in order to conserve time and meet with more groups throughout the state.

8. *Public information fund* — The public information fund, which was an integral part of the seven-point program, made possible most of the projects which required finances. Although less than a majority of teachers participated in this fund, several opened their purses for the second time around. Those in the more militant areas were the heaviest contributors.

With these funds, we were able to finance the Legislative Action Committee meetings, pay part of the cost of film production, provide every district with prints of the film, finance essential costs of the flying squadrons, secure the services of a public relations counselor and print thousands of copies of our special publications.

At the close of the 1965 legislative session, one of the state's leading editors wrote me a letter commending the IEA for its efforts and declared: "You can credit yourself with creating a good deal of the momentum which resulted in the passage of the sales tax and increased appropriations for Idaho schools."

Contributing Factors

With perhaps one exception, the breakthrough in Idaho can be attributed to specific factors which may not be unlike those in other states where successful campaigns have been conducted.

1. *We were confronted with a crisis* which had to be resolved. Conditions were deteriorating, and teachers expected their state association to do something about them—which it did.

2. *We had sound objectives* based on needs and focused on state responsibility.

3. *We had [illegible] well-developed plan of action* which [illegible]ved the members.

The pin, the $5 contributions, the political action, and the telephone survey all gave teachers identity with the cause. The film, publications, reports, TV and radio appearances, news releases, and the flying squadrons gave concrete evidence that something was being done.

Without the plan there would have been chaos. With it we had the means of directing the energies of teachers. There was something in it for everyone.

4. *There was political involvement.* Teachers had an opportunity to exercise their rights as citizens. Although many of them are still frightened by the thoughts of political involvement, this is an essential part of a state association campaign for increased financial support. In Idaho our members helped elect legislators who were more favorable to education, including six educators who held seats in the 1965 session. Perhaps even more could have been accomplished had we developed a powerful political arm along the lines adopted by Utah or California.

5. *Constant pressure was maintained* for the enactment of needed legislation by keeping the issues before the public and making use of legislative channels. It is not enough for an association to clearly define its legislative objectives. It must also press for their enactment into law.

We appeared before legislative committees, we made daily contacts with legislators urging passage of our legislative measures, and we continued our use of news releases and supporting publications. In other words, we followed the pattern familiar to all of you who work with legislators. This was an essential element in the breakthrough for increased state support.

Equally important, however, was the pressure applied from the field. Telephone contacts, personal visits, and a flood of correspondence at the right time kept issues alive. One legislator implored me to "get the teachers off my back." Others more friendly to our cause encouraged teachers to keep in close touch, and said they appreciated the interest and support.

6. *We had assistance from other groups and individuals,* including those members of the legislature who did not for a moment relax their efforts in behalf of the public schools. A state association provides leadership and triggers the action, but it cannot win the fight for better schools alone.

7. *Militant neighbors* — The one unique element which will not be found in most state assocation campaigns was the influence of the unity and firmness of the teachers in our neighboring state of Utah. In and of itself, this would not have brought about change in Idaho, but it was a contributing factor to the success of our campaign. Political and civic leaders were not unmindful of the possibility that the IEA would be forced to apply sanctions if the legislature failed to produce. We were fortunate in being able to turn the situation to our advantage.

One Chapter

The story of the 1965 campaign is but one short chapter in a never-ending book. Already another chapter is being written as new problems loom ahead. Whether complacency or opposition will follow the breakthrough remains to be seen. Already the sales tax, enacted in 1965, is headed for a showdown in the November election. The conservative proponents of austerity in government have not yet conceded a "new day" for the state. They have over 60,000 signatures calling for a referendum repeal of the sales tax. Only 25,500 were needed. They have organized a state-wide campaign to repeal the new revenue program in its entirety, and they plan to run their own candidate for governor.

The IEA, like other state associations, continues to battle for the advancement of education within the economic and social climate peculiar to its own state. Over the years it has significantly influenced the course of educational legislation in Idaho. It will continue to do so as long as it is responsive to the challenge of new issues calling for vigorous action.

State Action for Increased School Support— Role of the State Legislature

Oliver Ocasek

CHAPTER 3 OF *Goals for Americans* calls upon Americans to face up to their responsibilities in financial support of public education. Recommendation 15 states:

> The state can help the districts help themselves—(a) by liberalizing (where necessary) state-imposed ceilings on local property taxing powers, (b) by liberalizing constitutional or statutory limitations on borrowing power of local districts, and (c) by reforming property assessment practices.[1]

The same author who headed this task force on reviewing the needs of public education has also written:

> There may be excellence or shoddiness in every line of human endeavor. We must learn to honor excellence (indeed to demand it) in every socially accepted human activity, however humble the activity, and to scorn shoddiness however exalted the activity. . . . An excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher.
>
> The society which scorns excellence in plumbing because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because it is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water.[2]

The writer is none other than our own John Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. What Gardner is really saying is that the training necessary to become a good plumber or a good philosopher is expensive, more expensive today than yesterday and more costly tomorrow than today.

The cost of public education, operating expenses not capital outlay for the fiscal year 1960, was $15 billion. It is estimated that the same level program with the increased enrollments and increased costs will amount to over $30 billion by 1970. With the operating figure for this nation now at the 20 plus billion figure, the dilemma of this decade is how to convince the public that if they want quality schools, they must pay the necessary tax dollars.

Too many people lay the blame for the social ills of mankind at the door of the schoolhouse. We need to spend

---

[1] John W. Gardner, National Goals in Education, from GOALS FOR AMERICANS, © 1960 by The American Assembly, Columbia University, New York, New York. Reprinted by permission of Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.

[2] Gardner, John W. "Quality in Higher Education." *NEA Journal* 47: 364; September 1958.

Senator Ocasek is a member of the Ohio Senate and Assistant Professor of Education, College of Education of The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.

the necessary *dollars* to make good common *sense* in meeting the individual needs of our future citizens. The way to make a person a tax producer rather than a tax consumer is to prepare him in a comprehensive educational program.

Too many generalities are forever given. Now, for some specific answers to pursue in this difficult problem of state support for public education. As a member of my state's Education and Finance Committees of the State Senate, I have learned these lessons through the practical school of politics.

1. Whereas real estate, fixed land, and buildings were once the major source of wealth of this nation, they no longer represent an adequate tax base to support the increasing costs of public education. Other taxes need to be levied to support public schools. I mean sales taxes, income taxes, excise taxes, liquor taxes, and really I mean a combination of them.

2. Tax valuations of property for tax purposes are unrealistic and outdated. For Ohio for the year 1962 the state average of all property classification was 38.65 percent of so-called "true and marketable value." We cheat the support of public institutions by low property valuations for tax purposes. The result of this situation is to have millage rates which sound too high. In my own school district (Nordonia) we pay 36.92 mills for school purposes. If my property were at 100 percent valuation for tax purposes, my millage would be nearer 15 mills.

3. Proper financing of public education in America is a triumvirate responsibility. The basic responsibility is the states'. Here must be laid a firm foundation of minimum financial support. In Ohio we have a School Foundation Program which provides one of our rich districts 9 percent of its operating expenses (several districts, wealthiest in the state, receive no state support because they do not levy the required minimum 10 mills for school purposes) to 90 percent of operating expenses for the poorest district in the state. Local school districts have the duty and the right to enrich this minimum program by local tax support. Akron, the major city in my district does this to the tune of over 80 percent local support. We have quality education in many areas of my state. This has come about through strong local desire to support public education by taxes on real and personal property. Federal support as championed by the NEA is the right direction—enrichment programs levied upon a stronger state and local base.

4. Of the some 100 laws that I have sponsored or co-authored in my eight years as a state legislator, many are in the field of education. The one most significant to me is the education of the vote necessary for bond issues and levies at regular elections (to a majority vote requirement).

5. And finally the blue shirt must be established as a co-equal for the white shirt in our school curricula. The comprehensive high school in America must become a reality. The programs needed for meaningful preparation in vocational and technical education must be taken from paper plans and put into existence.

American education has given us "free" public schools, universal education, compulsory education, and "equal" education for future opportunity.

But the concepts of "free," of "all," and of "equal" are not yet resolved, for our schools still cost much money and need educational programs based upon different levels of achievement and the varying needs of pupils.

This, then, is our picture as one politician-educator sees it:

Draw in your coloring book, nearly 50 million pupils, crowded into this picture as they are into the classrooms of America; color them gold for they are the hope of tomorrow; draw in the overworked teachers, administrators, and school helpers; color them tired white; do not draw in the necessary therapists, psychologists, nutritionists, counselors, and specialists because there is no invisible color for nos-existent personnel; draw in the school administrators or, better still, just their gray shadows because they do not stand still as they play their roles of many things to many people most all of the time; draw in the austerity-minded politicians forever studying and talking about the problems of education—color them pink-faced because they have been following their constituents too often rather than leading them. Draw in the citizens, the voters, color them confused—one hand open to help make his community a better place in which to live with good schools and the other hand tightly holding his purse.

And now draw in professionally trained and adequately paid teachers—all the necessary school team personnel needed to provide quality education—draw these people with smiles, not frowns; hope, not despair; public encouragement rather than criticism, and color in the dollar sign to do the job that must be done in the dynamic 60's; paint it big and green. This, then, is the picture and color it crystal clear.

The Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance as Viewed by a Local Administrator

Earl C. Funderburk

OUR SUBJECT today is certainly a pertinent one and very obviously a controversial one. Although not a new problem, recent months have seen it climb into screaming headlines. The local, state, and federal partnership has been in existence for a long time. You know the history. I believe that most will agree that the partnership of the federal, state, and local levels of government in providing support for public education is necessary and can be good, but we must go further to see that there is a complete understanding at each agency and level within the partnership, concerned with the same objectives of providing quality education for all children and youth of America. And also, the U.S. Office of Education, state departments of education, colleges and universities, and local school systems have unique and peculiar roles in developing this quality educational program. Efforts at each level should supplement and complement efforts at all other levels.

Federal-support programs have enabled local school systems to provide long-sought services, facilities, and equipment which could not have been provided without such support. In my suburban school system of 95,000 pupils, federal programs now in effect include NDEA programs for instructional equipment and guidance services; vocational education programs for equipment and for the salaries and travel expenses of instructors; special programs under the Civil Rights Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; rehabilitation programs for retarded pupils; federal impact aid under Public Law 874 and 815; the School Lunch and Milk Programs; and others.

Each of these programs is operated under a separate contract or set of special regulations administered by different offices in the federal government. The multiplicity of special financial accounts, reporting procedures, and the dispersion of special responsibilities among staff directors and supervisors present a challenge to administration at the local level.

Dr. Funderburk is Superintendent of Schools, Fairfax County Public Schools, Fairfax, Virginia.

To avoid overlooking significant resources which may be available to us, we have employed a full-time "search and seizure" officer, a very personable and intelligent young man without whom we would be at a considerable disadvantage.

We are extremely pleased that many new support programs are becoming available. As a Washington suburb we are intimately familiar with the growing inadequacy of the local property tax, the shifting sources of community wealth (and the power of the federal government to tap these sources), the mobility of our population, the need for national unity, and the many other arguments for increasing federal support.

We are equally familiar with the time-honored principle of local control, and we believe that given proper resources we have the ability to develop educational programs of high quality.

What we are simply saying is this: We need and we must have federal money to produce the type of education needed in America. I have always strongly endorsed federal support for education. I shall continue to do so, but only in the form of appropriations to the states which in turn will distribute it to the local districts. I cannot support a steady stream of categorized assistance with its inherent control. Let the men and women who actually run the schools, with advice from the local community determine the curriculum and the needs of the pupils, not the President's assistants, or the Congress, or any other national power structure.

Yes, because federal aid is so desperately needed, many educators have expressed gratitude rather than dissatisfaction over the expectation of control. But I recall that in the long ago a birthright was sold for a mess of pottage. With all control of finances and programs in the hands of the federal government we all know that great evil can result. Power can change the nature of man, and money is a powerful weapon.

We fully accept the fact that infusions of federal money with no strings attached might result in reduced local support in many areas, and in some areas even financial apathy with no improvement in education.

We are aware that unsettled questions of church-state relationships have been a serious roadblock to more general federal support, and we hope that the efforts of the Horace Mann League may soon help to resolve this issue.

We are aware of the enormous disparity between educational programs from one locality to another, even between neighboring school systems. For example, a recent report on the elementary-school libraries in the District of Columbia revealed an average of less than one library book per pupil. Next door in Fairfax County we have an average of nine library books per elementary-school pupil, and we are adding more under Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Furthermore, we have a full-time librarian in all of our 100 elementary schools.

This is not because we are a wealthy school district except in terms of family income. To the contrary, our taxable wealth per pupil is less than the national average and less than half that of some of our neighbors. Yet we must provide 65 percent of our school costs from local taxes.

We shall continue to accept federal aid for libraries under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for even though we do have 10 times more books than some school systems, we can never have too many.

In the meantime we will face another year of serious inadequacy in physical education, music, and foreign language teachers and administrative personnel.

The items will change from one school district to another but the problem is the same: how to direct federal support into states and local districts so that it may be used to erase rather than to exaggerate the imbalances which have developed locally.

Categorical support for special areas of national deficiency in education is good, and it is a proper function of the federal government but it does not meet the fundamental needs of American society to do so in this manner. If federal support is to reach several billion dollars, as the President has promised, and as it must in the years to come, we shall have to find a better means of control than categorical delineation. To fail in this would be to create at the local level a patchwork of special programs rather than a coordinated and logically organized program responsive to local conditions.

A local school system responding to too many special support programs, each with a separate statutory basis and a separate set of administrative regulations, cannot avoid a crippling diversion of its administrative capacity from the mainstream of general education. Yet the federal government has a responsibility to require high standards, to insure universal opportunity, and to encourage local effort.

What kinds of federal controls are really needed to meet these requirements, and how may they be applied? First, the problem of requiring high standards. Many standards which are quite pertinent to the quality of education are subject to objective measurement. Among these are staffing ratios, school housing facilities, equipment standards, academic preparation of teachers, size of library collections, supply levels, and even certain aspects of pupil achievement.

The last-mentioned item is under fire right now because of Keppel's suggestion that sampling might be used to assess the performance of our schools. Of course, pupil achievement scores are not valid for comparing the efficiency of a rural Georgia school with that of a school in a California suburb. Such scores might be useful in comparing a school or school system with its own previous performance, and possibly provide some pertinent data for evaluation when properly interpreted. But I fear a national testing program.

We are accustomed to meeting state and regional standards for staffing ratios, buildings, libraries, teacher certification, and the like, and I would certainly not propose that the federal government pre-empt state and local functions in accreditation.

However, there is no insurmountable reason why the states cannot develop and agree upon some appropriate standards for use by the federal government as a basis for general-support payments to the states, and through the states to the local districts.

I have read as carefully as possible the most recent federal legislation, and my interpretation is that the control of public education is being transferred to the central government. Our federal government officials, many of whom I consider personal friends and whom I respect, deny this intent. Many of our school boards and many of our professional people are seemingly unaware of this situation or they do not care.

Many of our prominent school officials have already sounded the alarm, not to stop federal aid, but to insist on legislation that gives *general aid* to education and gives it in substantial amounts. If the President of the United States and the Congress believe in state and local control, they should indicate this by having state and local leaders help in drawing up new legislation to restore whatever controls have been lost.

It is crystal clear that if we want high-quality public education, more money is due from the one adequate source of taxation—the federal treasury. I believe with all my heart that the great wealth of this nation must be taxed where it is to educate the child where he is, whether it be in Appalachia or in the slums of New York City.

The time is now for local and state school boards and school administrators, local and state, to insist on being at the drawing boards when the next designs for federal financial-support legislation are being made. As an educator I demand that right. I am not convinced that all the brains are at the national level. There are brains at the local and state levels.

It is said that to be successful the school superintendent must know the local power structure and deal with it; but now he has a double problem. He has to deal with power structure on the national level.

We must also realize that not only in education has leadership and influence slipped away from the local and state levels, but also in philanthropy, industry, and government. Are local leaders "fiddling while Rome burns"? It is our fault—yours and mine—that we have permitted control of local civic and educational life to shift to national leadership by default.

This principle has already been applied in special aid programs, such as Title III of NDEA, where the Council of Chief State School Officers developed standards which were used extensively as a basis for federal participation in equipping schools for better instruction.

The second prerequisite to general federal aid is a means of insuring universal opportunity. Now that both the Supreme Court and the Congress have cast out the principle of "separate but equal," there can be no alternative to compliance. The struggle will be difficult and often bitter, for in many communities a full and rapid integration will not serve the best interests of society. But as a nation we have made our decision, and the decision must be carried out.

The national executive must require compliance regardless of whether financial support is involved, but I do not think that financial support should be a sword of Damocles. Of course, universal opportunity means more than racial integration, and it means more than overcoming specific cultural and economic disadvantages. It means a rigorous and challenging education for the brilliant and the average as well as the disadvantaged (I am more concerned now about the average child). It means education in *all* areas worthy of human endeavor as well as in science and language arts. It means in the words of one of North Carolina's great educational governors, Charles B. Aycock, "the right of every child born on this earth to have the opportunity to burgeon out all that is within."

The third requirement for any general-support program is a provision for equalization and the encouragement of local effort. The several states have accumulated a great body of experience with a variety of equalization plans, and our textbooks abound with new ones.

The present Title I of ESEA is a sort of side-door entrance to equalization. It is poverty oriented, and it requires maintenance of local effort, but it is a program of special grants for special projects. It does little to enhance the mainstream quality of the general school program, and it irritates rather than relieves the problem of financial support for those local districts which are already overtaxing themselves in a losing struggle for quality in general instruction. For all its benefits, desirable and vital as they are, it adds the burden of planning, administering, and coordinating a $1 billion sideshow which by law may not interfere with the act in the center ring. However, the Education Act of 1965 will force an accommodation, for better or worse, for many issues associated with integration and the church-state question. Thus, it may become a significant step toward general federal support.

Provisions for equalization and encouragement of local effort can be applied in a general-support program just as well as in a series of special-aid programs. Stimulus aid for selected educational needs is welcome at the local level and the many programs now in effect are helping to overcome some critical deficiencies. Now let us face squarely the problem of finding adequate support for our basic school program in a manner that will meet our criteria for raising standards, insuring universal opportunity, and encouraging local effort.

From my viewpoint as an administrator at the local level we are ready for partnership with the federal government. Call the federal government a junior partner, if you will. I prefer the *federal partner* to be a *silent partner*. I prefer a real partnership in the main enterprise rather than an extension of our present relationship in which the federal government has the role of concessionnaire for a series of sideshows or peripheral programs. And I prefer that this new federal participation be directed to the improvement of state-supported programs through a federal-state-local triumvirate rather than through the addition of a separate and direct federal-local program.

This goal of coordinated, general support may not be an easy one, but it is less difficult now than it was five years ago. We might take our cue from John Gardner, who has said in effect that too often we mistake a golden opportunity for an insoluble problem.

Now what of the future of this partnership? Certainly we can, as we Americans have always been able to do, surmount the problems I have enumerated. We point out first that all of those engaged in education at all levels must become more expert and thoroughly professional. Local school boards, local administrators, state school boards, state school administrators, and the U.S. Office of Education must assume an attitude of mutual respect, of mutual aims; agree on the responsibilities of the partnership, keeping in mind that regimentation is not necessary; let the state and national partners fund all possible monies and give directions (not control); let the local community provide all possible funds to meet its own local school needs, and keep control; and let a spirit of cooperation and friendship prevail. As Finis Engleman, former Executive Secretary of the American Association of School Administrators, says:

> The time is here . . . to use all the leadership America has to offer: So a cooperative scheme for designing new legislation and for improving education in all districts is needed. Let each level—local, state, and federal—

play its appropriate role. Certainly the talent to be found on the national level should be utilized. But if the diversity, creativeness, imagination, and operational know-how at local and state levels are to be salvaged, present trends must be reversed.[1]

We can and we must get away from acrimony. Let the only purpose be to get the job done. Each partner must supplement and complement the other. Then the possibilities of the partnership for the development and advancement of quality education are far greater than the detriments that are inherent. And the days to come will be much brighter for education than many would believe.

---

[1] Engleman, Finis E. "Who Will Lead American Education?" *School Administrator* 23: 7; November 1965.

2

The Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance as Viewed by a State Administrator

"It Takes More Than Two To Tangle"

Ewald B. Nyquist

NOTE: The concept of a national or creative federalism is defined as a sharing of responsibility by federal-state-local agencies. The respective roles in this partnership are summarized. Finally, some problems in relationships are discussed under several categorical headings.

The many competent colleagues in the Department who have assisted in mounting several federal programs in recent months, are responsible for having, from time to time, so clearly and cogently instructed the author on the nature of their share of the problems.

I am delighted that those who are responsible for this program have characterized the subject before us as a partnership, for such, indeed, is and must be the case if the most effective use is to be made of the total resources available for education, including the shiny new federal dollar. It would have been inimical to my views for the conference topic to have been entitled, for instance, "Problems in Local-State-Federal Relationships." There is a marked difference.

I must tell you, first off, that I, personally, warmly welcome this enlarged partnership, this new troika in education—under certain conditions. First, I should like to make some comments on the respective roles of the federal government, the state, and the local school system in education today. From the founding of our Republic, it was intended that there be what can be termed a national federalism. The entire phrase, *national federalism,* is important. Just plain *federalism* is the belief that our national government is a league of sovereign states, forming a compact resting on the good faith of the parties involved, the states having independent powers and the national government highly restricted in its own functions.

National federalism, however, is the concept that there is a partnership, a federal-state-local sharing of responsibility, rather than a strict separation of powers. National federalism ac-

---

Dr. Nyquist is Deputy Commissioner, The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany, New York.

knowledges the importance of state and local levels of government with their accompanying powers and responsibilities but affirms the primacy of the national government.

A recent article in *Fortune* analyzes what President Johnson has frequently referred to as a "creative federalism." It is premised on the belief that our society is "exceedingly lively, increasing its rate of innovation and expanding its range of opportunity." The article states:

> In the long American dialogue over states' rights, it has been tacitly assumed that the total amount of power was constant and, therefore, any increase in federal power diminished the power of the states and/or "the people." Creative federalism starts from the contrary belief that total power—private and public, individual and organizational—is expanding very rapidly. As the range of conscious choice widens, it is possible to think of vast increases of federal government power that do not encroach upon or diminish any other power. Simultaneously, the power of states and local governments will increase.[1]

This creative federalism includes, if we are to believe it, a deliberate policy of encouraging the growth of institutions and state and local agencies which will be independent of and in part antagonistic to the federal government power, not subservient arms directed by central authority, and that tension and perhaps what can be called a "perennial misunderstanding" between Washington and its partners are required for further innovation and growth, for without friction there is no progress.

National federalism, then, in education, is a sharing of responsibility for carrying out an important public purpose which all partners have in common and which none could achieve as well without the cooperation of the others.

In giving you this definition, I am reminded of some recent advertising about Irish Coffee. The promoters of Irish Coffee emphasize the synergistic effect which results from drinking it by stating that the two ingredients taken together are infinitely more satisfying than either one taken alone.

A recent article by Roald Campbell, Dean of the School of Education at the University of Chicago, and one of his colleagues, suggests several elements in the future local-state-federal partnership in education:

1. A sharing among local, state, and national agencies is necessary in educational government. No one partner can substitute for the other.

2. If we are to have an effective partnership among local, state, and national agencies, each of the partners must be strong. Let me expand this.

I am as well aware as anyone that one of the administrative problems which plagues the U.S. Office of Education is the great range in competence of the several state education departments to provide the kind of innovation and creative leadership required today. Are there too many departments over their heads in giant problems of national importance and up to their knees in administrative midgets? Diversity, of course, is always necessary, but diversity should not mean general weakness or great variety in poor quality. Recognizing the need for state education departments to be stronger if they are to play the central role they themselves expect to play and expected of them by others, the federal government has provided funds in Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to strengthen the leadership of state education departments .

---

[1] Ways, Max. "'Creative Federalism' and the Great Society." *Fortune* 73: 122; January 1966. © 1966 Time Inc.

Unless states are strong in their educational leadership, they can expect to witness a decline in state-local relationships and a proportionate growth in direct-line communication and administration between local school systems and the federal government. The question at this point of time hangs delicately in the balance. The growth of the federal government's influence in education, meaning its direction and control, will occur only to the extent that the states neglect to exercise their responsibilites as well as their rights. One is the obverse of the other. Educational interests sooner or later turn toward those governmental sources willing to provide support and sound advice and away from those which abandon their powers or fail to exercise them.

I am not suggesting that the federal government should be a minor junior partner in education, as some of the major federal spokesmen for education so coyly and unnecessarily put it. I am arguing that the state can maintain a senior partner position only if it leads boldly, imaginatively, and creatively.

In the recent words of John Fischer, President of Teachers College, Columbia University:

> State Departments of education . . . are finding that it is not enough piously to assert that in the American educational system the State is the sovereign authority. The sovereign is now called upon to be also a leader, and to some state officers the call comes as a shock. . . . there can be sound and effective federal-state partnership only where the state agency is prepared to meet the federal agency at a comparable level of professional judgment and performance.[2]

3. The several states should exercise their plenary powers in education creatively. Here the authors mention the need for state leadership in achieving quality education by establishing good standards, by creating sound procedures for achieving effective local school systems, and by providing a foundation program of financial support. An exaggerated emphasis on regulatory and supervisory responsibilities and on following the right procedure instead of seeking the right result, puts a premium on being second-rate. A state education department today must be a moving creative spirit and an agent of constructive change.

4. As far as possible, the operation of schools should be delegated to local school districts.

I often think that the role of the state education department in relation to local school systems ought to be much like that of parents in rearing their children: Give them a lot of affection; try to set a good example; and, finally, get out of the way.

In my view, the role of the federal government is to identify national goals and needs in education, to provide massive infusion of supporting funds, and to evaluate our total effort as a nation.

The role of the states is to provide diversity in leadership, to provide organization and coordination of the educational system, to serve as a channel and distributor of funds for the support of education, to establish minimum standards for achievement, to lead in planning, to conduct research and stimulate innovation, to assist localities in evaluating results, and to provide stimulation to local school systems to go beyond a minimal performance. The state is the key to securing a proper balance of strengths among the local, state, and federal agencies composing what will increasingly become a calculated interdependence in education.

The local school system has the obligation of making the most imaginative and efficient use of the funds available from the locality, the state, and the federal government. Citizen participation and close cooperation with a variety of other social and educational agencies are essential. So is the achievement of adequate school size in order that a broad educational program can be maintained and choices in offerings made available to suit individual student interests. Local school systems, too, must have the greatest freedom possible to rise above any minimal standards established by the state and the federal government. And in saying all of this, I also *firmly believe that no school system has the right to be as bad as it wants to be.*

---

[2] Speech given at the Governor's Conference on Education, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, January 27, 1966.

I have believed it necessary to give you this background and wider perspective on the local-state-federal partnership in order that my remarks shall not be misinterpreted as sharp reactionary comments, chewing the mean "cud of bicker and reproof," or the faulting of new federal participation which needs encouragement and support, not carping criticism.

On the other hand, I do not intend that we should be so open-minded about the significant entrance of the federal government into education as to permit our brains to fall out. All of us have a responsibility to improve what we already have, to provide the federal government with fresh ideas, either to correct current programs and legislation or to fill in what program gaps there are.

If I were to choose between the opportunity to correct the problems in administering present federal legislation and the opportunity to encourage the federal government to enlarge its support of present and new programs in education, I would have to choose the latter. Fortunately, we are permitted to do both.

Let me put out for your inspection, then, several problems in our partnership, recognizing at all times, that the U.S. Office of Education has been as hard-put as we have been to inaugurate new programs of massive proportions.

If one were to generalize on the significance of these comments, I think it would be that the viability of our partnership in education, as in all things in an open society, depends upon a correct balance between freedom and restraint and a consensus on the requirements of accountability.

Fiscal Management and Program Planning

If states are expected to plan in an orderly and efficient fashion to integrate federal funds with their own, and to administer federal legislation creatively, they must know what appropriations are going to be well in advance of the beginning of a federal fiscal year, but Congress is late in passing appropriation bills. It would also help if one could count on federal authorizations for spending which have a longer life than just a year or two. As it is, Congress makes authorizations for appropriations which on the one hand, are too short in duration, making long-term planning impossible; and on the other, are tardy, causing short-term planning to be hectic. The consequences, of course, are inefficient use of funds when they do become available, uneconomical use of personnel resources, and ineffective education. We have painful problems as it is in living with two different fiscal years, a state calendar for state funds and a federal year for federal funds.

But this difference pales in significance in comparison with that of one central factor in educational planning:

the academic year. Has Washington, so far removed from the groves of academe, forgotten the rhythm of the educational community which pulsates with an upbeat in September and a downbeat in June?

For reasons which have to do with the prevention of lobbying for its own legislation, the U.S. Office of Education is prevented from planning and developing in advance of enactment, the necessary guidelines, regulations, and administrative procedures for carrying out legislative proposals which will finally be passed by Congress.

Those states which initiate their own planning in anticipation of such enactment, are thus left frustrated and idle for long periods, waiting for eventual federal action, which is often more "eventual" than "action." Frequently sharp adjustments in state planning have to be made owing to unforeseen and unexpected federal interpretations of the law. The best definition of intelligence I know is that it is anticipatory behavior.

Leading states, more and more, are developing long-range plans for educational programming and budgeting. In New York, working with the Governor's office and the Director of the Budget, the State Education Department has developed statistics through to the year 1980 and has submitted short- and long-term plans and estimates accordingly. There is no overall long-term federal plan to help us.

Federal aid is categorical aid aimed at correcting certain educational problems and critical areas of specific weakness. The result is undue fractionation of federal support into smaller and smaller components, thus tying the hands of state officials, reducing flexibility in dealing with local needs, and raising enormously the uneconomic cost of administration at the state and local levels. We need a cheaper way to make educational history.

In 1965, our Division of Educational Finance in the Department of Education distributed state aid to local school districts in the amount of approximately $1.2 billion, and such distribution required a staff of 25 persons. During the same period, federal aid amounted to about $200 million and its administration required a staff of more than 100 persons. As a forthcoming report has it:

> dollar for dollar, a State employee administering a State aid program is approximately 48 [*sic*] times more effective than a State employee administering a Federal program. The main reason for the great disparity is that State aid is administered as block grants (or as general aid) to educational districts to use as they think best for educational purposes. This method of aid distribution requires very little paper work and frees personnel for other tasks.[3]

Replacement of Priorities by Compulsion

Federal funds are for specific purposes. They both enlarge and restrict our freedom: enlarge it by expanding our capacity to fulfill urgent needs in education; restrict it, by focusing our attention on critical, categorical areas of weakness in education. The question is, Does the increased availability of federal funds, which we are almost mandated to administer and find politically impossible not to accept, attenuate in any way the accomplishment of other important objectives and other central obligations? Do other things, because they are not so generously funded or because so much administrative effort must be diverted to mounting new federal programs, receive less attention than they deserve?

---

[3] Governor's Office, unpublished report on federal programs and their impact on the states.

To what extent does the massive infusion of federal funds for specific purposes diminish in the minds of our own state legislators the need for increased state support for both special and general purposes? What extra effort must we exert to interpret to our own legislators the specialized or categorical purpose of federal programs and our further need for general state funds?

Overcontrol and Lack of Coordination

Many federal laws, but more importantly the usual federal regulations and guidelines, are excessively prescriptive and leave little latitude for state "imagineering" and the exercise of discretion at the state level. They constipate our internal organization with "administrivia" and undue bureaucratic drudgeries, even at the highest levels. Is it really true that nothing succeeds like excess?

The federal regulations developed for each piece of federal legislation often go way beyond what one would have expected from the mere reading of the laws in question. Excessive zeal for the protection of the taxpayer's dollar, the lack of sophistication and orientation on the part of many new employees, and the overcautious regard for accommodating every single fine nuance and meaning of legislative intent and comment made during Congressional debate on the legislation undoubtedly account for overcontrol in these regards.

So many separate regulations and guidelines for several related education laws result in contradiction and inconsistency. No two sets of regulations or guidelines bear much evidence of having been coordinated. Moreover, with their attention to picayune detail, even the regulations and guidelines for a single piece of legislation result in internal contradictions.

A final comment on guidelines. These are supposed to be suggestions, not mandates, but human nature and original sin being what they are, meaning that the ordinary administrator is unduly awed by the image of federal authority and likes to take the path of least resistance in any case, most local and state officials follow guidelines precisely without using their own imagination, again resulting in a circumscription of their own freedom and diversity. The federal government seems to be saying, "These are only suggestions, but don't forget who's making them."

We firmly believe that federal funds and programs should be subject to federal audit, only at the state level and only to assure their use for educational purposes. There is an increasing tendency for the federal government not to rely on the states to ensure that sound local accounting and fiscal procedures are followed, even in states which have pre- and post-audit requirements far in excess of even ordinary prudent controls.

No one can protest that one should be held fiscally accountable for money received and spent, but excessive prescription is wasteful, eliminates wholesome diversity, and is insensitive to the integrity and prudence really being exercised in the various states.

It would help considerably, it seems to me, if the federal government were to involve state and local officials more, in advance of the development of federal legislation, regulations, and guidelines. While there is some involvement, this seems to be unduly limited and often occurs in the face of impending deadlines, thus leaving little time for real reflection and considered advice.

This brings me to a near-fatal weakness in much federal legislation. The federal government has a habit of developing legislation, especially derivative regulations, in terms of the lowest common denominator among the states. In other words, no matter how competent State X might be to assist in carrying out federal programs, federal ground rules and laws seem to be written to accommodate what weak States Y and Z are *not* able to do. Title III of the ESEA is a good example.

Bypassing of State Agencies

Is it appropriate that the federal government deal directly with school systems in some federal legislation, thus bypassing or eliminating the states? We see this happening in the Economic Opportunity Act and there are troublesome provisions in Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which furnishes funds for establishing supplementary services and centers. And there seems to be a shift in the administrative requirements of Title IV.

We believe that the concept of shared responsibility for education requires that the federal government depend on the states to carry out the mandates of federal legislation and utilize the technical services of sophisticated professional staff at the state level in helping local school systems use the funds wisely. Some state education departments are admittedly weak; this has undoubtedly led to such federal legislation. But this should not deter the federal government in law, regulation, or administrative action from using those state education departments which can be trusted to carry out the provisions of federal programs.

There is something ironic in a federal act which in Title I delegates to the states authority to conduct a program, even though under excessive prescription; in Title II again asks the states to administer the program and funds; in Title V gives funds to the states to strengthen their state education departments; but in Titles III and IV reserves discretion and power to the federal government with only a token appreciation of what states contribute.

Duplication of Programs and Lack of Consolidation

Finally, another criticism of the federal government as it relates to education is the proliferation of educational authorities and programs. By this I mean two things: In the first place, our lives are unnecessarily complicated by duplicate and overlapping federal legislation in education. Two or more Acts sometimes serve the same purpose. I know what our problem is at the state level. I have deep sympathy for local administrators who must fill out multiple forms in order to get federal funds from a growing complex number of separate but related sources. Title I of ESEA and the Economic Opportunity Act are good examples. What is needed in educational legislation is consolidation and simplification.

There is another aspect to this lack of coordination: Responsibility for education at the federal level is dispersed and proliferated throughout the federal government. It is not always easy to know who the federal partner is.

Compact for Education

I think we can expect the new interstate Compact for Education to have a salutary influence in the refinement and development of increased federal participation in education. This interstate

Compact has been established in order to strengthen the states' role in education and to assist in developing a nationwide policy in education. This Compact would not have authority, nor would it set policy. It would be a means of developing alternatives which ultimately will be made at the state or local level. According to Terry Sanford, former Governor of North Carolina and a leading light in this development, the Compact

> should furnish the states with the best available information. It should suggest appropriate goals. It should serve to exchange information, and to advise. It should provide the states with a forum for sharing experiences, improving standards, and debating goals.[4]

But the point I want to make is that this Compact will fail miserably if it does not influence directly the development of further federal legislation in education (a) in the kinds of new legislation to be introduced and (b) in the incorporation of such important procedural and administrative principles as will remedy the several weaknesses now characteristic of existing federal legislation and reinforce the central role of the states.

In closing, I want to mention some responsibilities which we may overlook. It is not enough that we keep on doing what we have always done.

We are in an era, as someone has said, where the "tidal wave of change . . . threatens the cherished orthodoxy, the sacred traditions, and the ancient assumptions of education."[5] I think perhaps the greatest insight anyone can gain today is the understanding that we must learn to live with ambiguity, conflict, and tension as facts of life, with very slowly evolving answers. The President of Syracuse University has said, "The liberated man lives between commitment and allegiance on the one hand, and curiosity and readiness to change on the other."[6]

Recognition of this polarity of tensions and of the need for maintaining stability and preserving continuity in the midst of constant change—this is the trenchant insight which will help all of us rise to the challenge now presented to education by the participation of the federal government.

We do not precisely know where the future lies, but we know that we have to plan for it. We have to gear up with frenetic haste to accommodate rapid change, but we need time for reflection. We need to change, to progress, but sometimes we need to resist change by bearing courageous witness to the virtue of what we already have. We must recognize those times when we must rather fight than switch. Let us not, like Victor Borge's uncle, find cures for diseases that do not exist, and then die from one of the cures.

I am reminded of an anecdote from the epilogue in a contemporary novel, *Captain Newman, M.D.*

> Destiny came down to an island, centuries ago, and summoned three of the inhabitants before him. "What would you do," asked Destiny "if I told you that tomorrow this island will be completely inundated by an immense tidal wave?" The first man who was a cynic, said, "Why, I would eat, drink, carouse and make love all night long!" The second man, who was a mystic, said, "I would go to the sacred grove with my loved ones and make sacrifices to the gods and pray without ceasing." And the third man, who loved reason, thought for a while, con-

---

[4] Sanford, Terry. *The Compact of Education.* Durham, N. C.: Education Commission of the States, Duke University, December 1965.

[5] Wolk, Ronald A. "The Challenge of Change." *1964 Current Issues in Higher Education.* Nineteenth Annual National Conference on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, NEA, 1964. p. 1.

[6] Speech delivered by William P. Tolley at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Colleges and Universities, November 14, 1962.

fused and troubled, and said, "Why, I would assemble our wisest men and begin at once to study how to live under water."[7]

Our new partnership with the federal government suggests that we learn how to lead and administer under markedly different conditions. I am confident we can. We can, for one thing, use the Chinese water-torture method: drip goodwill and common sense drop by drop on our conflicts and problems until they dissolve.

---

[7] Rosten, Leo. *Captain Newman, M.D.* New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. p. 331.

The Local-State-Federal Partnership in School Finance as Viewed by a Federal Administrator

Norman Karsh

I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today, to discuss some of the problems relating to the federal-state-local partnership in education. Though the theme of this conference emphasizes the financial aspects of this partnership, I know that you share with me the view that any discussion that limits itself to financial matters will fall far short of meaningful content and will obscure the primary issues and objectives of our endeavors. For this reason, I shall attempt to place the financial aspects of our partnership in its proper perspective, at least as I see it.

I imagine that the majority of those here today—if not all present—would appropriately be classified as financial managers. This title would apply whether you would be a comptroller, budget officer, finance officer, administrator, chief state school officer, superintendent, coordinator, commissioner, or any other of the many titles that we label ourselves with. I say this because whether we wish to or not, the demands upon all of us include the necessity to make or carry out decisions that are inextricably a part of the financial considerations of our agencies.

I used the term *financial manager,* but I believe it is the word *manager* that must bear the emphasis. In education today we are dealing with problems that far exceed anything that previously existed. At local, state, and federal levels, the education market is bullish (as they say in the stock exchange) and everyone is buying in. Our newspapers daily carry articles on the many changes, innovations, and controversies that the nation is experiencing. We are in the midst of what future historians may call the educational revolution, and, to use a popular expression, "all systems are Go."

It takes a manager to function successfully in an environment such as this. It is no longer sufficient to equip ourselves with only the limited knowledge applicable to a single sphere of operations, be it a local school district, a state-wide program, or even a federal program. We all play a vital part in a combined effort to bring the best degree of education to the students of this country. It is incumbent upon all of

---

Mr. Karsh is Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

us to know and understand the problems and pressures faced at all levels of government. And this is certainly not easy. But it is this task, I believe, that will be the key to our success. How well we relate to each other, how well we gain an understanding of each other's needs, how well we measure performance—these are the challenges.

It is for these reasons that I emphasize *manager* in the term *financial manager*. It connotes the ability to deal with many diverse and tangential elements affecting our operations, of which finance is but one. Education is big business. The nation is now spending about $40 billion annually. Just five years ago this amounted to $28.5 billion—and it has been estimated that five years from now these expenditures will increase to $52 billion.

As every educator knows, school finance is tied to taxes. The changing character of the city population has resulted in an erosion of the city tax base. While placing heavier demands on the city schools in terms of an increasing population with an increasingly varied cultural background, the new migrants have brought less wherewithal in terms of earning power to help the city schools serve them properly.

This problem is not restricted to the cities. Rural areas have felt the same pinch, and they have in addition another problem; because their population is scattered over a greater land area, they have an even more difficult time gathering the tax funds necessary to maintain good schools.

Thus, there is a kind of geographic imbalance in our local educational system. We can see its consequences in the paradox of outstanding schools on the fringe of a city, and abysmal ones at the core. We can see it, also, in the differences in expenditures among the states for education. It is a fact of American life that there are rich states and poor ones, and we can trace these disparities in the quality of these schools.

It was this situation that brought the federal government into education in a big way, starting with the National Defense Education Act of 1958. It was also this situation that led to the legislation that Congress has passed in the last few years, such as the Higher Education Facilities Act, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the Higher Education Act, as well as approximately 20 other pieces of legislation.

These laws do not represent a new division of responsibility. The states and local agencies still retain control of education, and both Congress and President Johnson have stated their determination to preserve this traditional arrangement.

But these laws do reflect a new partnership in education among the local, state, and federal governments. They reflect, in addition, an awareness that this nation has a common life, and that educational weaknesses in North Dakota or New Mexico affect Georgia and Illinois. We all pay the price for our national failures, whether those failures be reflected in a slow start in the space race or a high rate of unemployment. Therefore, it makes good sense for us to pool our resources throughout our society and at every level of government to ensure that no human talent is wasted.

I would like to tell you how the U.S. Office of Education has contributed to the total educational picture, at least in a financial way. In fiscal year 1956 the budget of the Office of Education was $166 million. Five years later, 1961, the figure was $539 million. In fiscal 1965, Congress raised the budget to $1.5 billion. This current year it stands at $3.3 billion, and in 1967 our request to the Congress amounts to $3.5 billion.

I believe a summary of the budget for the coming fiscal year will help to show what we are anticipating for educational assistance and what it will accomplish. I will cover our budget in terms of the major categories or types of support provided education.

The first such category embodies programs of *direct operational support of educational services*. This covers all levels of formal classroom schooling as well as school and public library services, and is designed to bring *immediate* aid to today's problems. For these purposes our budget includes $1.8 billion, 51 percent of the total. The greatest portion of this amount, $1.2 billion, is provided to improve the educational opportunities of 7.5 million children from low-income families, the educationally deprived. In addition, we hope to:

1. Provide improved vocational and technical training for 5.8 million students at the high-school, post-high-school, junior-college and college levels

2. Give public library services to 2.5 million people and improve existing services for 25 million

3. Enable substantially increased procurement of better library resources and instructional materials for use in elementary, secondary, and higher education institutions

4. Allow the award of some 650 grants to assist in raising the quality of developing institutions of higher education

5. Support some 800 projects under the community service and continuing education program, a program designed to bring together the talents of universities and local citizens in meeting community challenges.

Construction of facilities is the second largest part of our budget and this totals $864 million. Of that amount, $720 million is earmarked for higher education facilities; $76 million, for vocational education facilities; and the balance of $68 million, for elementary, secondary, research, and public library facilities.

In higher education, these construction funds will support over 1,000 projects. They will include science and mathematics buildings, language facilities, engineering facilities, lecture rooms, general use classrooms, and cooperative graduate centers. For vocational and technical schooling over 400 projects will be supported. Eighty-seven projects will be funded at the elementary and secondary levels. Continued assistance will be provided for construction of public libraries and educational research laboratories.

Under the category of *student aid*, $428 million is proposed for educational opportunity grants, graduate fellowships, work-study programs, student counseling, and assistance in financing loans of students in colleges, universities, and post-secondary vocational schools. Under the program of educational opportunity grants we will support the undergraduate education of an estimated 200,000 students having financial need, those who have the ability but not the money to begin and complete college. Fifteen thousand graduate students preparing for professional teaching careers at the university level will receive fellowships to help them realize their ambition. Part-time employment under the work-study programs will be provided for 450,000 college students and 35,000 vocational students, all of whom will need such employment to continue their education. Approximately one million students will be aided by the various loan assistance provisions.

Our fourth category of assistance is *teacher programs*. Here we have budgeted for over $227 million, all of which is designed to help improve the quality of teaching at all levels and to assist in bringing more teachers into the schools and geographical areas needing them the most.

There are four principal enactments relating to the training of teachers: the National Defense Education Act, the Fulbright-Hays Act, P.L. 89-105 relating to the handicapped, and the Higher Education Act of 1965. Each has its particular area of concern, and each provides a continuing impetus to better preparation of teachers.

For teachers engaged at the elementary and secondary level our 1967 program will provide for:

1. 28,000 participants at 670 institutes for English, modern foreign languages, reading, history, geography, economics, civics, and industrial arts (NDEA)
2. 50 grants to institutions engaged in teacher training programs in order to assist them in developing and strengthening their graduate and undergraduate program (HEA)
3. 5,800 two-year fellowships for graduate study leading to a master's degree (HEA)
4. $54 million for grade and high schools to acquire laboratory and other special equipment to be used in teaching mathematics, science, and other critical subjects (NDEA).

For teachers at institutions of higher education we will provide for:

1. Over 1,600 fellowships and awards for special study by teachers in non-Western language programs (NDEA)
2. Strengthening of the 98 language centers at the 61 universities where such study is now afforded, and assisting in the establishment of 12 new centers at schools diligently preparing to incorporate language and area studies into their basic educational programs (NDEA)
3. 35 institutes to train some 1,000 participants in the effective application of educational equipment in the classroom (HEA)
4. $14.5 million to help colleges and universities fund over 350 projects for the procurement of materials and equipment, including closed-circuit TV, to improve undergraduate instruction (HEA).

Under the Fulbright-Hays Act, which provides an opportunity for American teachers to live in the country whose language they teach and thereby also learn about its people and society, we will award grants to about 650 persons.

The last item under teacher programs covers handicapped children. In fiscal 1967, $25 million is earmarked to prepare men and women for careers in educating the handicapped. This is an area of critical need; the estimated national shortage of teachers of the handicapped is 240,000. Our program authorizes traineeship for full-time graduate study and for summer session special study institutes. Our present budget will provide the awarding of over 9,000 grants to train individuals and 20 grants to organizations to develop teacher programs in areas of the country not currently served.

For *educational research*, the fifth major category, there will be expenditures of $107 million, a 550-percent increase in the research dollars available just three years ago. This reflects the growing awareness of the importance of research to educational advances. These monies will permit enlargement of present research programs and the initiation of new effort in such areas as the training of educational researchers, development of research capability in universities not now possessing it, education theory, curriculum improvement, and guidance techniques for disadvantaged students. A major effort will be made to effect early transfer of new and usable knowledge to the classroom.

To this point I have covered program categories completely substantive in nature as opposed to those essentially administrative. By administrative I mean those programs and dollars specifically designated for administration and supervision. There are two such categories: funds provided for the support of state educational agencies, and funds provided for administering the U.S. Office of Education. Combined, these two sums equal $95 million, 2.7 percent of the total budget request for 1967. Of the $95 million, $45 million is for state agency support and $40 million is to run the Office of Education. I consider it significant that *more administrative funds are provided to the states,* and this is done in recognition of the fact that there is where the great bulk of programs are carried out, and there is where the greater administrative capability must be developed.

It is apparent from even such a brief rundown of the budget as I have given that there are heavy responsibilities upon the shoulders of all concerned—governments at local, state, and federal levels and also, of course, participating private institutions. Not the least of these responsibilities is that relating to financial operations.

All of us here today fully understand the necessity for proper fiscal accountability. At all levels of our operation—local, state, or federal—we are entrusted with the responsibility to administer public funds, funds made available through taxes levied on all citizens. I know that I am constantly reminded of this by members of the Congress and by the General Accounting Office, and I am sure that all of you have similar counterparts.

As the demands for greater expenditures for education are placed upon us, so also are the responsibilities to assure their appropriate use. The situation, of course, is not limited to funds for education, but applies equally to all operations of public agencies. To meet these responsibilities, all of us have had to install accounting and reporting systems to provide us with the information we believe is essential to give us this assurance. And as all of our programs have grown, so have the requirements for more and more detailed data.

In good part, we are not the masters of this situation. As public servants, we are responsible to the citizenry and their elected representatives. Their demands for information are not much different from any individual's demands upon a retailer to provide quality merchandise. People want their money's worth—and they are entitled to it—whether it is a television set or efficient administration.

I am concerned with the manner in which we have responded to the need for financial data—and I know that many of you are equally concerned. I do not mean to imply that this is a problem only at the federal level. It applies equally at all levels of government, though there is at work here the "multiplier effect," which broadens the impact of informational needs as it is applied from federal to state to local levels.

We are now collecting so much financial data on all our programs, that

I wonder how we are able to use it all. I am sure that even with the utilization of ADP techniques and all the fantastic developments in computer operations—without which we would be inundated—we have far outstripped our mental capabilities to absorb this information.

The obvious conclusion here is that we have probably reached the point where we should "fall out and fall in" again. Financial analysis is absolutely essential in the total decision-making process. But it is only a part, and it should not assume such proportions that financial managers become preoccupied with the detailed machinations of a system at the expense of "not seeing the forest for the trees."

I am suggesting that there is a requirement for all levels of government to thoroughly review and assess their financial operations, to bring to bear that imagination and innovation so necessary if we are to improve upon our methods of accountability and reporting. Indications are that significant changes are called for in present requirements for data. We at the federal level are going to make every effort to further simplify and reduce the burdens now imposed on state and local governments. Our goal is to ask only for that information which is essential to valid management purposes.

Earlier, I mentioned that our 1967 budget includes $45 million for grants to state educational agencies. This money—$7 million more than in 1966 and $37 million more than in 1965—is to assist them in strengthening their departments of education and in improving their ability to identify and meet state educational needs. It may be used for a wide range of purposes. This is especially true of funds provided under Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Included under that authority are projects for the improvement of "management and administration." In view of the recent tremendous increase in federal education dollars now going to states, better management and administration are more pressing than ever. Title V provides an ideal medium through which state educational agencies may hire the employees and develop the skills required in the budgeting and fiscal areas of administrative management.

And in furtherance of our hope to strengthen our partnership, personnel of the Office of Education have for several months been visiting state education officials to advise them in regard to administrative requirements stemming from new legislation, particularly the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These visits are in response to state requests for assistance. We will honor every such request because we share a common interest, and because one of the great benefits which derives from these conversations is the increased understanding gained by both parties—understanding of purpose, of goals, and of hopes. The creation of mutual understanding is a main key to progress in any field, including education programs and their joint implementation by federal, state, and local governments. We shall do all we can to contribute to this understanding, and we actively solicit the advice of state and local education officials. We need and want the benefit of their thinking.

If I have seemed to stress the role of the states, it is because their role should be stressed. For the states have priority in the intergovernmental partnership in education. There are reasons for this. First, the Tenth Amendment of the Constitution makes education a state function. Second, a decentralized state education system is our heritage and tradition. And third, although the state can delegate much authority to local school boards and agencies, it cannot relinquish its ultimate responsibility for quality and equity. The state, therefore, is the senior partner in this governmental "firm."

And may I point out that both the Administration and the Congress intend to keep it this way. President Johnson has already stated his policy: that the last word in education—the final control—must reside, as it always has, with state and local agencies. Congress expressly stated its policy in passing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. That Act put a new premium on strength at the state level by providing funds to state educational agencies, saying, in effect: "Strengthen yourselves, and here's the money to do it." And although it may be superfluous to say so, I can assure you that the new U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe II, has neither the intention nor the desire to alter the traditional relationship which reserves control of administration, textbooks, curriculum, and personnel to state and local authorities. To put it another way: The road ahead of us is a road of decisions. Somewhere along the line someone has to decide—and this should *not* be the federal government—*what* we will teach in our schools, *who* will teach it, *where* they will teach, *when* they will teach, and *how* they will teach. And someone has to work out the framework—financial and otherwise—within which these decisions will be made.

In concluding, I would like to express the hope that there will be greatly increased counsel among the three levels of government. Together, we can achieve the educational excellence desired for this nation and we can contribute much to the greatness that is sought for society. While the task is difficult, the opportunity is at hand, and the rewards will be great.

Federal Financing of Student Costs in Higher Education

M. M. Chambers

For our purpose here the phrase *student costs* means the charges ordinarily paid by the student or his family incident to his continuing his formal education. They may include fees for tuition and other incidentals, charges for room and board and laundry and other essentials of maintenance, necessary travel expenses, and the cost of books and other tools of learning which the student must purchase.

Federal financing of these expenses includes all the various channels through which the national government pays them in whole or in part for selected students.

What Is Past, What Is Current, and What Is Coming

Let us first sketch a little of the history of the subject, then try to discern the main elements in the present complex and moving picture of it, and lastly observe the apparent direction of some of the currents and also try to envision what the scene may be or should be a generation ahead.

One stray thought in the background is that in the national academies for the education of career officers in the U.S. Armed Services, the federal government has always paid student costs in full, including not only bare essentials, but also stipends to provide pocket money for the students.

Moreover, in the plans for the education of citizen-soldiers and reserve officers in selected civilian colleges (and these plans have been operated in one form or another for at least a century) for 50 years there has been some provision for at least a small amount of pecuniary compensation for upper-division students who voluntarily have elected to pursue their military studies at advanced levels so as to become eligible for a commission in one of the Armed Services upon graduation from college.

Some of the more recently developed of these plans, especially the so-called Holloway Plan which was first devised and used for the Navy Reserve Officers' Training Corps and was subsequently adapted for use by the Army and Air Force, cover virtually the entire cost of a four-year college education for selected students who obligate themselves to serve on active duty at least four years after graduation.

As producers of officers and reserve officers for the Armed Forces, the

---

Dr. Chambers is Chairman of the Survey Team, Frankfurt, Kentucky, and Visiting Professor of Higher Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

various ROTC plans have generally turned out to be quantitatively about as important as the Armed Services academies themselves. To the extent that they involve federal financing of student costs, the motive has been and is to serve the specific national purpose of recruiting and training qualified officer material for the national defense.

During the past half-century federal financing of student costs has appeared in many other forms, each owing its appearance, and sometimes its disappearance, to what seemed to be the paramount needs and demands of a particular time. As early as World War I there was some federal provision for educational benefits for disabled and partially disabled veterans. During the great depression of the 1930's there was the student work program of the National Youth Administration (about 1935-1941). Beginning in 1944 there was the famed G.I. Bill and an accompanying measure providing special benefits to disabled veterans. Soon after the peak of the operation of the main measure had been passed in the early 1950's, there came a new and somewhat different G.I. Bill for veterans of the Armed Services during the Korean episode; and now that its operation is terminating, we have the new Cold War G.I. Bill of 1966, which seems to establish a permanent national policy of providing educational and other benefits for virtually all persons who serve in the Armed Forces, within a reasonable period after their honorable discharge.

Going back now to the years immediately following World War II, there came the practice of several large federal agencies "farming out" their research and development projects by making grants or contracts with universities deemed most capable of doing the job. At first the dominant consideration was to get the job done, and without much thought to aiding the institution or to the subsidizing of students; but almost every well-organized project includes provision for the employment of students at various levels as research assistants, graduate trainees, or in other capacities which not only provide part-time compensation, but also facilitate the advancement of the student's studies.

The volume of federal grants and contracts swelled enormously in the late 1950's and 1960's partly, no doubt, owing to the momentous orbiting of the first Sputnik in 1957. Probably no one knows with precision how many students' careers are currently being subsidized as by-products of this vast program, or exactly what is the total of all students who have been financially helped by it during the past 20 years; but the numbers must run into many thousands.

Another product, at least in part, of the Sputnik era was the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which made generous provision for increasing numbers of graduate fellowships which subsidize the student full time for as long as three years, and stipulate that no service shall be required of him. The NDEA also opened up the federal student loan program, available to undergraduate and graduate students up to a maximum of $1,000 per year and an over-all maximum of $5,000, at low interest and on favorable terms of repayment, providing even for remission of as much as half the loan for recipients who entered the teaching profession and continued in it as long as five years after graduation.

It is a matter of history that the NDEA loan program was substituted at the last minute for a program of federal *scholarships* which had formed the core of the original bill, but which was dropped by a narrow margin on account of influence from the White House. It can be noted at this point, too, that at about the turn of the present year 1966 it became evident that the present Administration will not recommend the continued funding of the loan program out of tax moneys, but envisions the "phasing over" of this entire enterprise to private lending agencies which will operate within interest rates and repayment terms fixed by the government, with the difference between these and the very generous terms maintained for student borrowers being paid to the lending agencies out of tax funds.

If we skip entirely certain special provisions for loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and osteopathy contained in an act of 1963, and for nurse traineeships provided for under the Health Professions Assistance Act of 1964, we notice that the NDEA has been amended to include a student work program somewhat after the fashion of the National Youth Administration student work program of the late 1930's.

We must also notice the push that has occurred within recent years toward the enactment of some type of measure which would give *tax credits* against their federal income tax obligations to students who are paying income taxes and to parents who are paying income taxes and at the same time paying substantial shares of the expenses of one or more children in college. There were said to have been more than 100 bills of this general type introduced within a single session of Congress; but the idea is probably best typified by the measure ardently supported by Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut, and which came within three votes of passing the Senate about a year ago. The same bill was again voted down in the Senate only last month, this time by 10 votes.

A group of some 20 conservative private-college presidents, mostly in the area of Chicago and northwestern Indiana, were very active in support of this measure. It may be pushed again in Congress, but it is probably dead. You will note that it offers nothing to any parent unless he is paying a federal income tax. This automatically eliminates thousands of low-income families having several children, for such families pay no federal income tax and have nothing to gain from a *tax credit.* This is what causes opponents of the measure to say "it would not help those who need it most, but it would help those who need it least."

The Treasury has estimated that the Ribicoff Bill would cost the government more than $1 billion annually in lost revenue. The outspoken Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon says: "There are many better ways of using $1 billion to support education." He reports that Roger Freeman, a conservative lobbyist, told the Senate Finance Committee that 75 percent of the money would wind up in the coffers of colleges through increased fees. Actually, says the Senator, the proposal was devised to help colleges, *not parents,* for colleges would *raise their charges* to recapture the amount of the tax credit. Parents who could not claim the credit would be far worse off than they are now!

These are some of the reasons why the tax credit idea was opposed by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and why it has never been indorsed by the American Council on Education.

Some Lessons of Experience

Before shifting our gaze from the history of these various measures for federal financing of student costs, we can note that thus far the movement has been most active as a result of some great national upheaval such as depression or war; but by now there is developing a different climate of opinion. The G.I. Bill of 1966 is intended to be a permanent measure—not one to peak and taper off within a few years as did its predecessors—but one to operate continuously to provide suitable educational benefits for all civilians who sacrifice substantial periods of time in the Armed Services.

It is also gratifying to note that some lessons have been learned as to the ground rules of such an undertaking since it was first begun on a really large scale in 1944. To name only a few, one may notice that the G.I. Bill of 1966 makes no provision for payment of tuition fees separately as such, but simply pays the veteran a monthly sum which he may use as he pleases. In contrast, the 1944 act provided payments to cover specified items, including tuition fees (whatever they might be, up to a stipulated maximum), and limited sums for books and supplies, plus the standard maintenance allowance. This was an open invitation to all institutions to raise their tuition fees up to the stipulated maximum; and many of them, especially private institutions, lost little time in doing so. One may say this was in fact a much-needed subsidy to the institution; but one cannot overlook the fact that its tendency was strongly to make college attendance more difficult for nonveteran students. In other words, it effected a *narrowing* of educational opportunity.

But the blackest sheep who crowded through this loophole were the fraudulent fly-by-night schools, usually proprietary but sometimes masked under a nonprofit charter, hastily organized for the sole purpose of defrauding the government and the veterans by charging the maximum fee and providing a minimum of instruction, all of questionable quality. If you are beyond middle age, you probably personally recall some incidents of this disgraceful footnote to American educational history.

Equally reprehensible were some of the abuses perpetrated under the on-the-job training provisions of the act of 1944, by unscrupulous employers who exploited the veterans by employing them as fabulously cheap labor and then providing them with little or nothing worthy of the name of instruction, for which the government was paying. The G.I. Bill of 1966 contains no provision for on-the-job training.

The foregoing are mentioned only to illustrate that some lessons have been learned. It is not intended to imply that in the late 1940's all colleges acted fraudulently, or that all private employers were unscrupulous. Most of all, it is not intended to imply that the operation of the G.I. Bill of 1944 was swamped in corruption. It has always been understood that the venality here described was no more than a drop in the bucket. It has long since been generally agreed that the billions of dollars which the act of 1944 cost the nation's taxpayers, and which occasioned a good deal of fiscal fright at the time, have been more than fully repaid by the veterans through higher-bracket income taxes paid as a result of higher earning power gained from the educational benefits they received.

The nation today is stronger and more humane and further advanced than it could have been if there had been no G.I. Bill of 1944. The fact, one may suppose, is sound and ample justification for the adoption of the permanent national policy of educational benefits for veterans of the Armed Services in war or peace.

Another side effect of the G.I. Bill of 1944 is important, and often overlooked or not understood. The great increase in college enrollments occurring in the late 1940's dealt a deathblow to the long-nurtured notion that most young men and young women of good average physical and mental endowments were not worthy of education beyond high school, that higher education was properly for only a small minority of the very superior, if not in intelligence, then at least in wealth and social standing.

The no-nonsense way in which the veterans from every social class and of every level of intelligence from average upward performed their college studies with earnest application and success worked a permanent change in the climate of college life. The coonskin-coated rah-rah boy of earlier years was supplanted by slightly more mature students who "knew the score" in life. The languid son or daughter of wealth or social cha-cha, lazily enjoying a four-year loaf, has been a rare species on the campus ever since.

The change was fortified and documented by the historic report of the President's Committee on Higher Education in 1947, which compared the test scores of millions of soldiers in the Army General Classification Test with those of college students on similar college entrance examinations, and concluded that *one-third* of *all* young Americans possessed ability to accomplish creditably four years or more of college study, and that *half* of the total appropriate age-group would be able to pursue with profit to themselves and to the nation at least two years of college education.

There were many other factors, of course, contributing to the progress toward the current situation in which practically half of all high-school graduates are going on to further formal education, and even conservative persons are accepting and talking of the oncoming era of *universal higher education.*

Student Aid Under the Higher Education Act of 1965

Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, concerns student assistance. It consists of four parts:

1. *Educational Opportunity Grants* are in fact scholarships (and constitute the first broad-scale program of scholarships for undergraduates). They may range from $200 to $800 a year, and must be matched by a like amount of institutional aid. In addition, $200 may be granted if after one year the student is in the upper half of his class. The student must be full-time, and his need great, with his parents able to contribute no more than $600 toward his education. Stress is placed upon identifying and making commitments to eligible high-school students, especially in the eleventh grade and lower.

2. *Guaranteed Loan Program,* with loans to be made voluntarily by banks or other lenders and insured by the government against death, disability, or default. The government pays all interest (not exceeding 6 percent simple interest) while the student is in school, and 3 percent after graduation during the repayment period (student paying 3 percent). If family income is over $15,000 before taxes, the student will be responsible for the full 6 percent interest, without subsidy for interest or insurance. The program may be operated in a state either by the state or by a nonprofit organization. States have until 1968 to decide whether or not to operate the program.

3. *College Work-Study Program* for students whose family incomes are low, with preference given to those below the "poverty line." The student may work up to 15 hours per week while classes are in session and up to 40 hours a week during vacation periods. He must be at least a three-fourths-time student. The government furnishes 90 percent of his wages, the college 10 percent. He may work either within the college or for an outside public or private nonprofit agency. The college is committed to furnish the remainder of the student's need in gift aid or loans, assisting his placement within or without the institution, and recruiting eligible students.

4. *National Defense Student Loan Program,* with the government supplying 90 percent of a loan and the college 10 percent. No interest is charged while the student is in school at least half time; and 3 percent interest and repayment of principal in installments are to begin about a year after he leaves school, after which he has up to 10 years to pay. Deferment of payments is allowed for full- or half-time college attendance, military duty (3 years), Peace Corps duty and VISTA (3 years), or less than half-time college attendance working for a degree (3 years). Undergraduates may borrow up to $1,000 a year, up to a total of $5,000. For graduate students the maximums are $2,500 a year and a total of $10,000. Those who become teachers will have 10 percent of the loan cancelled for each year of teaching, up to 50 percent of the loan. Teachers in schools with a majority of their pupils from low-income families ("deprived areas") may have the entire loan cancelled at the rate of 15 percent for each year of teaching in such schools.

First let us note that the *Guaranteed Loan Program* is intended to supplant the *National Defense Student Loan Program,* thus relieving the government from providing the bulk of the loan money and leaving the government obligated to pay only a part of the interest and provide insurance. This would transfer the business almost wholly to commercial banks and other lenders. Whether bankers want this or not seems to be a cloudy question. Some say it is not attractive to bankers because they prefer to lend to other borrowers at rates more lucrative than the stipulated 6 percent simple interest. Others say the bankers really want the business because they know that many bright and promising young people would become accustomed to being their clients, and this would tend to stimulate greatly their business in future decades. Probably the banks will go into the business, but with an effort to build and maintain their image as that of a friendly avuncular institution that is really doing the student a favor. Conceivably, of course, if the banks should refuse the business, the loan program would be a failure unless the government revised the terms to make them more favorable to the lender, or continued to fund the loans itself, as it has done for several years under the National Defense Education Act.

In the Executive Budget for the ensuing fiscal year, the NDEA Student Loan Program was funded only to the extent of a small fraction of what would normally be expected. Evidently the intent of the Administration was that this program would be concluded quickly in favor of the new Guaranteed Loan Program. Many objections to this plan seem to have arisen among leaders in the Congress, however, and latest indications are that the transfer may be spread out over several years.

This would probably mean additional funding for the NDEA Program for some time.

If we search for principles which characterize the whole of Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, we shall notice that both the Educational Opportunity Grants and the College Work-Study Program lay heavy stress upon identifying and recruiting students whose family incomes are actually below the poverty line, and the benefits of these two programs are largely or wholly limited to students in that group. In places where I have made a few local inquiries, I have found that these two programs are getting under way slowly because most college admissions offices have not been accustomed to searching actively for students from that income class, nor are high-school students in that income class accustomed to going to college in any considerable numbers. Thus, the colleges are inclined to complain of lack of eligibles. The remedy will require some constructive changes in the customary relations between secondary schools and college admissions offices.

We notice, too, that even in the two loan programs, though we ordinarily say no factor of need enters into eligibility for a loan, yet both programs have at least some tangential slant toward the "war on poverty." Thus, as we have noted, applicants under the Guaranteed Loan Program whose family gross income is over $15,000 receive less favorable terms than others; and under the National Defense Education Act Loans, the only borrowers whose loans may be wholly cancelled are those who teach seven years in schools in "deprived areas." One might perhaps say that the most recent slant in federal legislation for student aids is markedly toward helping those who need it most, those whose family incomes are in the lowest levels.

This is not true, of course, of the new G.I. Bill of 1966, nor of the older programs of graduate fellowships under the National Defense Education Act, and those under the various federal agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Science Foundation, where no questions are asked about financial need, or at least the awards are not scaled in accord with need (except to the extent they make added provision for dependents).

The whole network of federal student aid programs, some of which are not so much as mentioned in this discourse, has become so complicated and diverse that mastering its details and keeping abreast of new developments have almost become a full-time profession. Therefore, I shall make no effort to go into the detailed rules of their current administration. Some of these, for the most recent legislation, have not yet been written.

The Broad Policies, Not the Details of Administration

At the broadest level of generality, some glimpses can be had of how the federal student aids fit into the nationwide scene, and perhaps some of the ways in which they affect the shape of higher education can be discerned.

Traditionally there is scarcely any more popular object of charity than the bright but needy young person making his way through college. By this very token, student financial aids cannot but be thought of in many quarters as within the category of "welfare" expenditures which are otherwise mainly for the indigent, the aged, the unemployable, the dependent, and not for the self-supporting above the poverty line, those of productive ages, and the full-time employed (except the mothers of dependent children). For one or another of these reasons, welfare clients have dropped out of the mainstream of the economy, which is normally expected to afford opportunities for self-support to the main body of others.

My point is that in higher education we have as yet neglected to provide basic opportunity for the mainstream of present and prospective students by failing to make tuition-free *public* facilities for higher education accessible to all. By stressing the "individual rescue" and "fringe" aspects of the problem, we are ignoring the main concept of free public higher education for all who are qualified, and indefinitely retarding its implementation.

Frankly, the ideal expressed by the Educational Policies Commission in 1964, *that every high-school graduate should have access to two years of education beyond high school, with emphasis on intellectual growth, and tuition-free,* will hardly be achieved through any system of individual student aids no matter how enormous or complex it may be. It can be most nearly accomplished most quickly by opening the doors of *public* universities, colleges, and junior colleges (old and new), *tuition-free* to qualified comers.

This was conceived as the responsibility of the several states (although since the days of the Confederation the government has made land grants to the states to aid public higher education), and for more than a century, especially during the last half-century, the forms and the volume of federal aid to the state institutions, notably the 68 land-grant colleges, have multiplied.

For a century all of this support has been categorical; that is, for specific categories as broad as that of the land-grant colleges, which have become very inclusive, down to minute categories as small as particular research projects. Federal grants or contracts for project research are of the nature of compensation for desired work, a device by which the government "farms out" some of its research work to universities and colleges, and, originally at least, were not thought of as a channel of support for higher education at all. Thus the money went to the institutions thought best equipped to accomplish the work.

Since 1958 the government has moved slightly toward a general, uncategorized support of public higher education (as in the Higher Educational Facilities Act of 1963), and the inclusion of special provision for grants to public two-year colleges and technical institutes in that act seems almost to be a direct step toward spreading the accessibility of public facilities of higher education for all. In the same act the provision for facilities of graduate study can have the same effect if administered with that purpose in view.

But one cannot avoid wondering if it would not be better for the strength and responsibility of the several states if the Congress could bring itself to abandon, at least in part, the practice of categorical grants, and make to each state an unrestricted grant, scaled in accord with relative need, for the development of higher education in the state in whatever manner the state legislature might determine.

To carry the idea further, we arrive at the proposal of Professor Heller of Minnesota that the government might well remit to each state a percentage of the federal income tax collected in that state, to constitute a federal contribution to that state for the support of whatever public purposes to which the state might choose to allocate it.

These ideas are not currently popular, but their day may come. Certainly they could go a long way toward reducing the enormous complexity of the system of federal grants-in-aid to the states which has grown up over many decades. They might tend to reduce somewhat the immense federal bureaucracy. They might place in the lap of the states some important responsibilities for policy and administration which should probably belong to them.

For example, I am somewhat disturbed when I observe that some of the federal acts providing categorical aid specify in some detail the structure and operation of the state agency for the administration of the act within the state. For the most part, the state legislatures seem to rush to comply unquestioningly with these dictates, often stemming not from the act of Congress itself but from the mind of an obscure federal administrator of the act. This seems somehow not to comport with the dignity of a state in our federal system.

There is no question but that the grants-in-aid must and will continue, and in fact increase proportionally; but must they be splintered into so many categories, each with its voluminous administrative regulations written in Washington, so that their widespread effect on the structure and operation of state governments makes the states resemble a collection of 50 uniform provinces in great part administered from the national capital? Are we abandoning federalism? Is this necessary? Here is a very important issue in intergovernmental relations.

Another point which must not go unmentioned is the fact that most schemes of student aid, either scholarships or loans, have in the past had a strong tendency to channel public money into private institutions, and to encourage them to raise their student fees. The effect has often been to enable students who would go to college in any event, to attend a more expensive college than they would otherwise be able to afford. Generally little has been accomplished by way of getting into college students who would not otherwise be able to attend any college. Despite these shortcomings, however, almost all of the effects have their own special merits. To use the currently popular phrase, the government should continue and expand its business of financing student costs, as an affluent "junior partner" with the states and with private philanthropy.

In certain types of enterprises, such as the new G.I. Bill, it is probably fully justifiable to bypass the state governments entirely and deal directly with the institutions. But wherever feasible the federal government should abstain from invading the autonomy of the states in the support of their own higher education, and leave them as free as possible from petty administrative dictation from the national bureaucracy.

Finally, let me reiterate that the tendency of student aid programs has been to place predominant emphasis on students who are exceptional, having exceptional intellectual promise or exceptional pecuniary need, or both. The great body of average students, around average in academic achievement and of average family income, receive relatively less attention. If any selection is involved in the program, they are the ones who are likely not to be selected.

In this era of universal higher education, this relative neglect must be redressed. I am not advocating student aids for all students, but a policy that is simpler and more sensible. I am urging that immediate steps be taken to implement the nationwide policy of making *public* facilities for varied types of higher education accessible *tuition-free* to all high-school graduates.

This would not by any means abolish or reduce the need for student aid programs, including federal financing of student costs. This brings us to the truism that we have all heard and spoken many times: Student aids are not the *whole answer* to the problem of financing student costs for universal higher education. They are ancillary or supplementary to more basic measures. My plea is that we do not become so preoccupied with student aids that we forget the main issue, which is that of making *public* facilities accessible free of fees. This is the simple, equitable, and fundamental way for a free society to afford universal opportunity for education beyond the high school. This is a splendid chance for the 50 states to re-assert their responsibility and self-reliance.

Dual Enrollment

Alfred W. Beattie

BY DUAL ENROLLMENT I mean a system of education which permits parents to enroll their children legally in more than one educational system at one time. A child may be enrolled in high school part of the day and in a college or university part of the day. A child may be enrolled in an academic high school and in a vocational-technical school simultaneously. A child may be enrolled in a public school and a private school at one time. I propose to discuss that form of dual enrollment under which a child enrolls in a public and in a private school at the same time.

Dual enrollment, also called shared time, is not a new concept. Pfeffer[1] says that shared time is a brain child of Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson, according to Pfeffer, opposed establishment of a Theological Seminary at the University of Virginia. He proposed that the religious denominations build their divinity schools near the university campuses so that students could attend university classes for secular subjects and divinity schools for theological subjects. The parallel which I wish to discuss is an educational system which permits parents the choice of enrolling their children in public schools to take selected subjects, and in the private schools to take other subjects.

Why are we discussing dual enrollment? Members of the Catholic Church have the choice of sending their children either to public or to church schools. Members of the Lutheran, Presbyterian, Hebrew, and other faiths have the privilege of enrolling their children in public schools. Those who withdraw their children from public schools and send them to private schools do so by choice. If parents choose some agency other than the public schools to educate their children, the public is freed from any further responsibility.

Further consideration of the concept of termination of public responsibility for the educational progress of children withdrawn from public schools produces doubts about the correctness of the concept. Children who drop out of school, public or private, become a public problem. The general public must finance remedial or additional education for children who do not develop their capabilities, whether in public or private schools. Children who complete high school, public or private, and who are not prepared for the kinds of employment available, become a future public problem. One reason, then, for discussing dual enrollment is to encourage careful examination of public responsibility for the educational welfare of children enrolled in private schools.

---

[1] Pfeffer, Leo. "Second Thoughts on Shared Time." *Christian Century* 79: 779-80; June 20, 1962.

Dr. Beattie is Superintendent of the Allegheny County Schools, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The increasing cost of education, public and private, requires critical examination of heretofore practices and procedures. Building costs are increasing because of wages paid to workmen. Building material prices are increasing. Operating costs are increasing. Teachers' salaries are higher in terms of dollars received. Administrative salaries are higher. The cost of textbooks, library books, tablets, pencils, and other instructional and noninstructional supplies is higher. More sophisticated equipment, such as language laboratories, industrial arts machinery, and teaching machines, must be made available in order to increase the productivity of the school hours. All of these increasing expenses per child, multiplied by an increasing number of children, make education a growing burden.

School districts have taxing powers to raise necessary funds. Then too, they receive state aid. Private schools depend on assessments and contributions. The relative capability of private schools to finance an adequate program is a second reason for discussing dual enrollment.

Serious limitation in our educational achievement is another reason for considering dual enrollment. Identifiable deficiencies are so serious that our national welfare is affected. The federal government is concerned. Army tests over two decades have been uncovering appalling illiteracy, physical maldevelopment and underdevelopment, and poor emotional and mental health. Studies of persons receiving unemployment compensation, relief, mother's assistance, and other forms of public and private aid indicate that lack of education is a common denominator. All of these persons are supposedly products of our American school system, public and private.

Local and state agencies obviously have not provided educational opportunities for all according to their capabilities and receptivity. Schools have not solved the problem of dropouts. They have not provided longer or specialized instruction for the educationally deprived. Except in large cities, schools ignore the education of hospitalized and institutionalized children. The education of exceptional children is in its infancy. School libraries, with exceptions, are inadequate. Class sizes are unreasonable and in excess of the capabilities of a single teacher. Teachers' salaries do not attract the many capable persons needed. These weaknesses of public schools are the weaknesses of private schools also, if for no other reason than that private schools have less secure sources of income.

Now that national welfare is a critical challenge, the federal government has become a participant in education. However, the federal government is concerned about all young citizens whether enrolled in public or in private schools. The Constitution bars direct aid for the support of private schools. Yet, substantial numbers of citizens consider such schools essential. Children enrolled in private schools may have religious instruction during school hours. Children enrolled in public schools may not. Our courts have ruled that parents may elect to enroll their children in public or private schools. Federal aid for the improvement of the public schools only, therefore, does not solve the national problems of education, and apparently cannot be voted over the opposition of private-school advocates. Consequently, we are discussing dual enrollment as a means of making available the benefits of federal aid to education to children enrolled in private schools.

Initial federal legislation providing funds for the improvement of education was most beneficial to children enrolled in public schools. National Defense Education Act funds have been most helpful. The availability of federal funds encouraged districts to establish inservice training programs for science and mathematics teachers. They paid 50 percent of the cost of science equipment and apparatus for elementary, junior, and senior high schools. They matched local funds to purchase additional library books in science and mathematics. They encouraged districts to employ guidance personnel or other additional personnel. They helped districts provide foreign language laboratories. And, the National Defense Education Act funds stimulated the establishment of job-training courses in applied science and mathematics for high-school students.

These benefits of the Act were not equally available to private-school children. Their schools could not, under the Constitution, be given grants of federal aid. The Act did provide for loans at relatively low rates which private schools might use to improve instructional equipment and services. However, the aid was a loan and implied repayment. To receive full benefits of the National Defense Education Act, children must be enrolled in public schools.

In the impacted area legislation, initially enacted during the 1940's and continued up to the present, aid to communities is payable on account of children in public schools. Beginning in the early years of the 1940 decade, people began to congregate for employment in federal installations or war industries. In addition, federal employees and Service personnel were assigned to certain areas to carry out wartime assignments. The education of their children was a burden or exceeded the capabilities of the communities affected. Congress appropriated funds to cover part of the costs of operation and capital expenditures. However, communities receive this aid only on account of children enrolled in public schools.

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provides federal aid to establish and support area vocational schools. Area vocational schools may be (a) specialized high schools to prepare persons to enter the labor market, (b) departments of high schools, (c) technical and vocational schools for persons who left high school or who desire full-time study in job preparation, or (d) departments or divisions of junior or community colleges which offer training in no fewer than five different occupational fields. Funds to establish and operate vocational training, however, are available to public high schools or public area vocational high schools.

Broader legislation to provide federal support for public education was under Congressional consideration during the years in which the previously described legislation was enacted. However, advocates of support for private schools prevented passage. Provision for federal funds to aid the financing of school building construction was deleted from a public works bill. A later bill to provide federal funds for public-school building failed to pass. A bill designed to supplement state and local funds for public education failed to pass. Seemingly federal aid to education appeared impossible. Interpretation of the Constitution limits public support (federal, state, and local) to public schools. Proponents of private schools had sufficient strength to prevent enactment of legislation which did not include private schools.

In 1965, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This legislation provides limited support for education, and for the first time advances dual enrollment as a means of improving the education of private-school children with federal funds.

Title I provides federal funds for improving the education of children from families having an income of $2,000 or less annually. The state agency may make a grant to finance a project prepared by a school district, provided the project is designed to meet the needs of children from low-income families, and which has sufficient scope and quality to accomplish the purpose. Furthermore, the project shall make provision for the special educational services and arrangements for deprived children enrolled in private schools. Then, Congress suggests radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment, and dual enrollment as means of making services available to deprived children attending private schools. Funds and property shall be administered by a public agency.

Title II provides federal grants for the purchase of library resources, textbooks, and other printed materials. Each state shall prepare a plan for submission to the commissioner of education in which it designates an agency, such as the state library or state department of public instruction, to administer the plan. The plan shall provide that federal funds be paid to the state for the acquisition of books, magazines, documents, and other related library materials, for the purchase of textbooks, and for other printed material to benefit children in private and public schools. Furthermore, the plan shall establish criteria to be used in allocating and selecting library resources and textbooks. Allocation shall take into consideration relative needs of teachers and children and the equity of the availability of such materials to teachers and children of the state. Selection of library resources and textbooks for children in the schools of the state shall be made according to criteria included in the state plan as preapproved by the Commissioner of Education. Title to library resource materials and textbooks acquired through use of federal funds is vested in a public agency.

Title III directs the Commissioner of Education to make grants to stimulate provision of urgently needed services and to encourage development and inauguration of exemplary programs. Educational projects or proposals shall be prepared by local educational agencies and submitted to the Commissioner for approval. These proposals shall be designed to enrich the elementary- and secondary-school programs. The Act suggests a wide range of supplementary services and activities designed to promote mental and physical health, reduce dropouts, provide guidance, experiment with dual enrollment, provide essential equipment, promote foreign language study, and develop the use of mass media. Such proposals shall be planned in conjunction with representatives of the communities' cultural resources, including private schools. Again the public agency submitting the application shall be responsible for administering the funds.

Congress introduced into legislation two concepts which require consideration. By making public school agencies, state and local school officials, the originators of program proposals and the administrators of federal grants, Congress enunciates for the first time that public-school administrators and school boards have responsibility for planning the educational welfare of all children in the community. In addition, Congress designated in Titles I and III, dual enrollment as a means of making available to private-school children the educational improvements purchased with federal funds.

The designation of public-school officials as the originators of applications and administrators of federal funds is a Congressional compliment and challenge. At least Congress recognizes public-school officials as having the imagination, the diplomacy, and the flexibility of mind to work with private-school officials to the advantage of children, Congressional recognition may merely be an experiment to learn whether public-school officials can and will solve the problem of services to all children within the separation of church and state limitation.

I accept the assignment by Congress as both a compliment and a challenge. I am urging administrators and school boards to broaden their thinking to include children enrolled in private schools and to invite private-school officials to participate in the preparation of proposals. My colleagues and I in the county office share planning with the diocesan authorities. Although I am encouraging exploration of all the suggestions in the Act for providing services to private-school children, I am urging school districts to include dual enrollment projects. Dual enrollment appears to me to have the greatest potential for constructive accomplishment.

Dual enrollment (part-time membership in public schools) makes available to private schools many or all of the services and facilities of the public schools. Public schools have, or should have, services not available in private schools, and have, or should have, libraries and equipment superior to those in private schools. Public schools obtain funds through taxation; private schools, through gifts, tuition, or assessments. Public schools receive state aid on account of school building construction and instruction. Private schools do not. Public schools receive federal aid on account of vocational education, improvement of instruction and equipment in mathematics, purchase of library books in science and mathematics, improvement of guidance services, purchase of audio-visual aids, equipment of foreign language laboratories, and teacher training. Private schools do not. Children enrolled in dual enrollment projects receive benefits in services and facilities far in excess of those provided by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If private-school children are dually enrolled, school districts may use the Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds to provide services and facilities which are enriching to *all* children. Some examples might be helpful to clarify this statement. Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds may be used to purchase educational films or curriculum materials. These materials are made available to private- and public-school children. Operators of public-school film libraries must store these films separately, establish a second ordering and accounting system. Although additional work and expense is involved, private-school children would see only those films purchased with Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds. If the children were enrolled dually, they would have the use of the films purchased with local, state, and National Defense Education Act funds as well. In addition, children dually enrolled would have access to library resources, science and mathematics facilities, guidance and counseling, and foreign language laboratories purchased with local and National Defense Education Act funds.

A second example is vocational training. Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds might be used to provide some vocational training for private-school children. Dual enrollment would make a wider selection of courses and more equipment available. Children who enroll in private academic high schools to take English, social studies, and an elective, and in a public technical school have a larger choice of vocations. By enrolling dually they have access to and use of equipment and facilities purchased with local, state, and federal (NDEA, Vocational) funds, in addition to those made possible by Elementary and Secondary Education Act funds.

The public school system depends on the good will and support of adult citizens for funds for buildings, equipment, and operating expenses. It seems unreasonable to expect individuals who never received a day of service from public schools, or whose children do not receive services, to pay cheerfully the increasing taxes needed to support the schools. Yet, the number of persons who do not receive public-school services is growing rapidly. It is difficult for such persons to consider the public schools as theirs. More likely the private schools in their minds are "our schools," and the public schools, "your schools." Therefore, I suggest dual enrollment as a means not only to enrich the education of children in private schools, but also to win their respect and their appreciation of the need for the service of public education.

Dual enrollment programs are being operated in the United States. The NEA Research Division [2] and the U.S. Office of Education [3] prepared reports on the status of dual enrollment or shared-time programs. Dual enrollment programs are in operation in 35 states. Two hundred eighty school districts participated to some degree in dual enrollment programs during 1963-64. One hundred and eleven additional districts considered some participation for the 1964-65 school year. Michigan had the largest number of districts participating in dual enrollment programs.

Dually enrolled students select a wide range of subjects in the public schools. The largest number enroll in industrial arts and homemaking. In Kimberly, Wisconsin, dually enrolled children take English in the public schools. This is the only district with dually enrolled students in English. In other districts dually enrolled students elect business subjects, chemistry, physics, foreign languages, mathematics, music, art, physical education, and vocational subjects in the public schools.

Both studies report general satisfaction with the relationship. Some public-school people complained that private-school children enrolled in the most expensive subjects. Some private-school people objected to sharing instruction on the grounds that values developed in private-school instruction were not developed in public schools.

---

[2] National Education Association, Research Division. *Shared-Time Programs: An Exploratory Study.* Research Report 1964-R10. Washington, D. C.: the Association, April 1964. 22 p.

[3] Gibbs, James E., and others. *Dual Enrollment in Public and Nonpublic Communities: Case Studies of Nine Communities.* U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Circular No. 772. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965. 93 p.

The complaint about enrollment in expensive subjects is weak, if for no other reason than the complaint would not be made if the children were enrolled full time. The complaint about values led me to discuss with several Catholic educators a theoretical division of subjects which would be acceptable.

It is my understanding that some Catholic educators believe that certain subjects lend themselves more readily than others to the teaching of religious philosophy. A purpose of the private school is the development of religious philosophy. Therefore, these educators desire children in private schools to enroll in subjects which contribute most to developing religious philosophy. Apparently, these subjects are English and social studies. A solution to the problem appears simply to permit children or their parents to elect subjects to be studied in each school.

The proposal that parents decide what subjects their children study in each school meets the provision of Pennsylvania law. The Supreme Court decision in the Oregon case upheld the principle that parents may elect to educate their children in private or public schools.

Pennsylvania law provides further choices. Section 501 of the School Code of 1949 directs school directors to provide elementary schools for children of the school district. Section 502 gives boards of school directors permission to establish, equip, and operate a wide range of additional schools and departments as follows: high schools, trade schools, vocational schools, technical schools, cafeterias, evening schools, kindergartens, libraries, reading rooms, gymnasiums, playgrounds, schools for mentally and physically handicapped, and other schools and services.

The final paragraph of the Section says:

> No child shall be refused admission to the courses in these additional schools and departments by reason of the fact that his elementary or academic education is being or has been received in a school other than a public school.

This provision became part of Pennsylvania law in 1911. It was challenged by the School District of Altoona. The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania upheld its constitutionality in a decision handed down in 1912. In Pennsylvania, parents not only have the choice of sending children to a private or public school as established in the Oregon case; they may elect to enroll their children in both schools at the same time and to decide what subjects are to be studied in each school.

Under the provisions of this law, there have been dually enrolled children in the Pittsburgh schools since 1912. Last year 4,200 children enrolled in private schools took homemaking and industrial arts in city schools. Three thousand two hundred and sixty-three private-school children, residing in 28 suburban communities enrolled in their local high schools to take industrial arts and homemaking. One hundred and thirty-three children enrolled in private high schools dually enrolled in courses in area technical schools supported in part by their resident districts.

Dually enrolled children are public-school students during the time they are in public schools. Services available to students from public high schools are available to students from private schools during the time spent in public schools. Costs are borne by the district of residence. School districts receive reimbursement on account of dually enrolled children for that portion of time in public schools.

Parents and students are pleased. Our experience has been excellent.

The number of dually enrolled children in technical schools is growing, but the growth of dually enrolled children in junior and senior high schools has been slow. Parents have not been aware of their right of choice. School boards have not been aware of their responsibilities. However, the climate in Allegheny County is favorable to an expansion of dual enrollment.

I recommend and urge that administrators and school boards, wherever state laws permit, rise to the Congressional challenge and accept responsibility for the educational welfare of all children. I urge that dual enrollment programs be studied, discussed with diocesan authorities, and tried.

I propose that public schools become known for the warmth of their welcome to *all* children, full time or part time. That children are welcome, totally or dually, can be made known through public utterance, and the kind reception of public-school personnel.

School boards may and should, through consultation with parents and authorities of private schools, determine whether plans for new buildings and equipment should provide for private-school children. Perhaps school districts are having financial difficulties. Perhaps libraries, science laboratories, commercial classes, and language laboratories are overcrowded. Perhaps it will be extremely difficult to provide for part-time students. The welfare of the children and our national welfare require that public officials make the extra effort and provide the necessary facilities.

Further state support for education will be forthcoming when more children receive benefits of that support. Federal funds have been available since 1958 to improve services and facilities. More federal aid will be voted if and when there is assurance that all children will be benefited.

The advantages purchased with federal funds, past and present, can be made available easily to dually enrolled children. Try dual enrollment. It will help implement public responsibility for the educational welfare of all children.

Plans and Progress in Providing New Vocational-Technical Programs

John L. Feirer

Three major issues in vocational-technical education relate directly to the topic being discussed here today. These issues are as follows:

1. *How and by whom young Americans will be trained and put to work.* The major issue here is who will be responsible for vocational and technical education in America. Will the public schools, including high schools, area vocational schools, and community colleges, do the job? We are reviewing today a summary of the proposed programs being established in various states. However, if public education fails, will more governmental agencies do the job, agencies such as the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Labor Department, and private enterprise, including corporations and trade schools? Most vocational education leaders firmly believe that the best and most efficient method is for free public education to have and keep the responsibility for this important part of the education of young Americans. Leaders also believe that public education can do the job cheaper than any other governmental agency.

2. *Where funds will come from for vocational and technical education.* In spite of the greatly increased amounts of federal appropriations for these programs under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, there is still a serious shortage of monies available for accomplishing the big job ahead. This can be seen in Table 1. All types of vocational - technical education programs by all governmental agencies in the United States involved an expenditure of $2 billion in 1965, and the figure could approach $2.5 billion in 1966.

The authorized appropriation for vocational education for 1965 was about $177 million. However, the President's request for next year is $2.7 million below the current level. The impact of the President's budget is far greater than this request seems to indicate, however, since the grants to the states under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and other related bills should be $57.5 million more than was previously appropriated.

In this fourth year of VEA '63, the President is suggesting an amount much smaller than the amount originally authorized by Congress. One of the excuses given is that certain aspects of our society must be curtailed be-

---

Dr. Feirer is Editor of Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, West Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

TABLE 1.—EXPENDITURES FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION BY *ALL* GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS
(In millions of dollars)

Program	Fiscal 1965	Fiscal 1966
1	2	3
Vocational Education Acts	$ 168.6[a]	$ 246.9[a]
Manpower Act	350.9	386.4
Indian Adult Vocational Education	12.2	14.4
Technical Training Programs of the Department of Defense	1,050.0	1,093.0
Veterans' Training Programs	18.0	14.0
Programs of Office of Economic Opportunity	350.0	650.0
Total	$1,949.7	$2,404.7

[a] Not included are expenditures for research and development.

cause of increased financial responsibility for the war in Vietnam. Yet, in comparing appropriations for vocational education in the United States and Canada, we find that the federal appropriations in Canada amount to approximately ten times as much as in the United States. In other words, if the per-capita appropriation on the federal level for vocational education were equal to that authorized in Canada last year, the United States would have to spend at least ten times as much at the federal level as it did last year.

Federal funds for vocational education never exceeded $12 million until 1963, except for special war training programs. However, the future of many vocational-technical programs is in question today because of uncertainty concerning federal support for these programs. Several state leaders have indicated a reluctance to commit themselves concerning plans for 1967 until they know how much Congress will appropriate.

3. *How we can improve communications both inside and outside education.* The recent reorganization of the U.S. Office of Education has caused much confusion concerning who is responsible for what programs. Many educators interested in government-supported programs find it difficult to determine just whom they should contact. Another and far greater problem is finding out what state and local units are planning to do in establishing new vocational - technical education programs.

In January 1965, *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education* made a survey of state directors to discover what plans were in the offing for the following year. A repeat of this survey is now under way. In making both surveys, a form like the one shown on pages 97-98 was sent to the 50 state directors of vocational education. To recheck this information, a contact was made with the public relations officer of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education of the U.S. Office of Education to obtain the latest federal summary report compiled from data received in the U.S. Office of Education in June 1965. This information is printed in a bulletin published in October 1965.[1] In checking these three sources, it becomes immediately apparent that there is no well-established method of collecting accurate, up-to-date information concerning future plans for vocational-technical education.[2]

---

[1] U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Division of Vocational and Technical Education. *Summary Report of Vocational-Technical Program Development by States.* Washington, D.C.: the Department, December 1965. 50 p.

[2] Industrial Arts and Vocational Education. "Plans and Progress in Providing New Vocational-Technical Training Programs." *Industrial Arts and Vocational Education* 54: 30-32; November 1965.

Summary of Trends

A summary of the 1965 IA/VE Magazine survey is given here beginning on page 98. Note that replies were received from 23 states. As of April 1, the 1966 survey has received returns from 11 states: Arkansas, Idaho, Maine, Michigan, Missouri, Nevada, New York, Ohio, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Utah. Only three states are presently included in both the 1965 and the 1966 surveys. In this year's survey, nine states indicated that they will be spending $49,647,000 for equipment and facilities for the fiscal year 1967. Of this amount about $8,000,000 will be spent for equipment. The state of New York could present no figures until July, and Idaho reported that unless Congress appropriated the full amount authorized by VEA '63, there would be no new vocational training programs for fiscal 1967 in that state.

In answer to the question, "In which trade and industrial areas do you plan or anticipate greatest expansion—not only for 1967 but the years immediately ahead?" the most often mentioned were:

Metal trades (including welding, machine shop and sheet metal)	9
Electricity and electronics	7
Automotive service and technology	6
Construction trades	3
Graphic arts, data processing, and drafting	3

In answer to the question, "What new technical programs do you plan to start in 1967?" some of those mentioned included food services, horticulture, tool engineering, marketing, instrumentation, process control, mechanical design, chemical technology, nuclear technology, and data processing.

Additional information concerning state plans can be obtained by reviewing the material in the USOE bulletin titled *Summary Report of Vocational-Technical Program Developments by States*. The highlights of this report include the following:

1. A nationwide chain of states and locally operated vocational-technical schools is fast giving American education a new look. Although many of these schools are already in operation, the report indicates that at least 125 new schools are under construction, 209 additional ones are planned, and 62 existing centers have been designated as area schools. Thirty-three states report substantial additional appropriations for educational programs including vocational and technical education.
2. Reports from the states show that $235,728,000 is available for matching purposes; an over-matching ratio of 2 to 1.
3. Surveys to assist in the development of plans for construction of vocational-technical programs are either completed or in process in all states.
4. Forty percent of all funds allocated to states under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 have been used in the area of construction and new facilities.
5. The states report that 30 percent of federal funds went to secondary vocational education programs, 14 percent to post-secondary programs, 8 percent to adult programs, a little more than 5 percent to auxiliary services, and about 2.5 percent to programs or persons with special needs.
6. Vocational and technical schools have an enrollment of 5,283,200 for the fiscal year 1965, an increase of 5.3 percent over 1964 enrollments.

7. In the stated or projected activities of the states and territories for the fiscal year 1967 there is dramatic evidence that the long-awaited revolution in vocational-technical education is fast becoming an accomplished fact. However, the nature of the organization varies greatly among the states. Some states have a dual program in which vocational-technical education is available in community colleges and in area vocational schools. In other states, more emphasis is being placed on area vocational schools. This is particularly true in Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Minnesota, and Virginia. Other states have their strongest vocational-technical programs as part of community and junior colleges. Typical of this arrangement are the states of California, Michigan, and Texas. States that have a typical dual system of both community colleges and area vocational schools include Florida and Pennsylvania.

The future of vocational-technical programs in all states will be influenced greatly by the amount of federal support, by the success of present programs, and by the structural organization that is established to provide the services. For example, while Michigan has 19 operating public community colleges, analysis of school enrollments indicates that only 12 percent of the students are taking trade and technical courses. Only 1 of the 19 community colleges had more than 30 percent of its enrollment in vocational and technical subjects.

Much remains to be done if vocational-technical education is to be made available for all who want it, need it, and can profit by it.

IA/VE RESEARCH

VOCATIONAL EDUCATIONAL SURVEY

1. Can you indicate briefly what specific new program in vocational training you are planning for Fiscal 1967 at the secondary level? ______________________
____
____
2. What will be the estimated cost to your state of these programs?
$ ____
3. What amount do you expect to be matched by Federal funds? $______________
4. What specific new programs does your state plan for fiscal 1967 at the post-high school level? ____
Estimated cost to state? $____
5. What amount do you expect to be matched by Federal funds? $______________
6. Would you please estimate your expected expenditures for the following in all types of programs?

	Vocational	*Technical*
New Equipment ____________________	$______________	$______________
New Facilities ____________________	$______________	$______________
Remodeling ____________________	$______________	$______________
Research ____________________	$______________	$______________
Land Purchase ____________________	$______________	$______________

7. In which trade and industrial areas do you plan or anticipate greatest expansion—not only for 1967 but the years immediately ahead?
   (a) ______________________________
   (b) ______________________________
   (c) ______________________________
   (d) ______________________________
   (e) ______________________________
   (f) ______________________________

8. What new technical programs do you plan to start? ______________
____

Place any additional comments here ______________________________

NAME ______________________________ STATE ______________

A Report on Vocational and Technical Education Expansion Programs by State

THIS REPORT is based on a survey of State Directors of Vocational Education in the 50 states, D.C., and U.S. Possessions.

A QUESTIONNAIRE was mailed to them on January 4, 1965, requesting information on their plans, programs, and expenditures for utilizing federal funds in their states to expand their offerings and opportunities for vocational and technical education.

REPLIES have been received from 23 Vocational Education Directors in:

Alaska
*Colorado
Florida
Iowa
Maine
Maryland
*Minnesota
*Montana
*Nebraska
North Carolina
North Dakota
Ohio
Pennsylvania
Tennessee
Utah
Vermont
Virginia
Washington
*West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming
Washington, D.C.
Puerto Rico

Of these, 5 (*) reported that they were unable to provide information on their programs at this time as their plans were not completed and/or approved.

Summary

From this study it is evident that the states are planning to use the maximum federal funds allotted to them under the Vocational Education Act of 1963. Only one state, Wyoming, reported that it did not expect to use maximum funds. The 17 directors returning *completed* questionnaires, plus those from Colorado and Minnesota, reported that they expect to use maximum funds available to them.

EXPENDITURES in the 19 reporting states, D.C., and Puerto Rico in 1965 will total $73,967,368 in federal plus matching state funds.

FUNDS ARE BEING USED primarily for new facilities and equipment, the next largest amount for remodeling, and smaller sums for research and for land purchases.

******Equipment* expenditures in 15 states will total $9,844,216—7 will spend over $1 million and 8 will spend between $100-900 thousand.

******Facilities* expenditures in 15 states will total $13,857,500—8 will spend over $1 million and 8 will spend between $100-500 thousand.

Remodeling expenditures in 8 states will total $1,957,000.

Research expenditures in 10 states will total $370,000.

Land Purchases in 3 states will total $500,000.

* Plus a total of $10 million for facilities and equipment combined reported by Pennsylvania.

PROGRAMS at the secondary level and at the post-high-school level will be supported and strengthened with the construction of facilities, purchase of new equipment and the expansion of instructional personnel according to directors of vocational education. Specific programs slated for expansion in a number of reporting states include industrial education, business and office education, distributive education, home economics, and agriculture. Also programs will be devised to give more attention to disadvantaged youth or those with lesser skills.

AREAS OF GREATEST EXPANSION reported by the most states will be in electronics, auto mechanics, drafting, graphic arts, and electricity.

A Report on Vocational and Technical Education Expansion Programs by State

	Expenditures				
State	*Fed. & Match. State Funds	Equipment	New Facilities	Remodeling	Areas to be expanded—in order of greatest expansion
Alaska	$ 256,378	nr	nr	nr	Electronics, Auto Mech., Welding
Colorado	2,137,810	nr	nr	nr	nr
Florida	6,695,678	$1,000,000	$ 3,000,000	$ 150,000	Auto Mech., Electronics, Drafting, Air-Cond. & Ref., Const. Tr., Elect.
Iowa	3,241,684	1,000,000	nr	nr	Auto Mech., Auto Body, Machine Shop, Draft., Graphic Arts
Maine	1,318,504	659,000	nr	nr	El.-Electron., Metalworking, Graphic Arts
Maryland	3,290,770	500,000	1,055,000	0	nr
North Carolina	7,276,942	1,500,000	1,200,000	nr	Const. Trades, Auto Mech., El.-Electron.
North Dakota	887,414	375,000	0	0	nr
Ohio	10,539,178	1,400,000	2,500,000	500,000	Machine, Auto Mech., Auto Body, Cosmet., Weld. & Sheet Met., Elect.
Pennsylvania	12,157,626	($10,000,000)		nr	Electron., Data Processing, Technical Areas
Tennessee	5,300,520	50,000	2,000,000	0	Health Occ., Elec., Metalworking, Mech., Air Cond., Office Ed.
Utah	1,313,644	400,000	200,000	0	Auto Mech., Mech. Draw., Weld., Mach. Shop, Carpentry, Electronics

State	Expenditures *Fed. & Match. State Funds	Equipment	New Facilities	Remodeling	Areas to be expanded—in order of greatest expansion
Vermont	$ 501,510	$ 100,000	$400,000	0	El., Electron., Draft., Auto M., Foods Trs., Bldg. Trs., Plmbg.-Htg.
Virginia	6,159,484	900,000	800,000	$ 50,000	Electron., Auto Mech., Elect., Graphic Arts, Drafting
Washington	3,342,296	1,000,000	500,000	100,000	Draft.-Eng. Tech., Health Occup., Electron., Civil Tech., Wld.
Wisconsin	4,475,630	400,000	1,600,000	300,000	Electron., Weld., Metalworking, Drafting
Wyoming	381,572	nr	nr	nr	Auto Mech. & Body, Const. Tech., Diesel & Hvy. Equip., Graphic Arts, Electron., Refrig., Air-Cond., Htg.
Washington, D.C.	646,976	160,216	102,500	12,000	Ag., Auto Mech., Barber Shop, Bus. Mach., Graph. Arts, Elect.
Puerto Rico	4,043,752	400,000	500,000	345,000	Carpent., Masonry, El. Appli. Serv., Auto M., Power Saw. Mach., Elect.
TOTALS This report	$73,967,368	**$9,844,216	**$13,857,500	$1,457,000	

---

* Federal funds for vocational education only. Does not include funds for work-study programs authorized by the Vocational Education Act.

** Plus $10,000,000 reported by Pennsylvania for facilities and equipment.

nr — not reported.

A Report on Experience with the Technical College in Northern Virginia

Barnard Joy

THIS IS A PROGRESS REPORT. Northern Virginia Technical College, which I shall call Nova Tech, is less than a year old. It is the first college of its kind in Virginia. The enabling legislation passed by the Virginia General Assembly in 1964 was revised a month ago. After July 1, we become part of a state-wide system of community colleges that includes four area vocational schools now under the jurisdiction of local school boards, three 2-year branches of Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and three 2-year branches of the University of Virginia.

When I speak of Northern Virginia, I am speaking of a 2,000-square-mile area that lies across the Potomac River to the west and south of Washington, D.C. The seven local jurisdictions that comprise this area, the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, and Falls Church, and the counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudon, and Prince William, are part of the Washington, D.C., Metropolitan area. As is true in many other suburban areas, the population is growing rapidly. Twenty-five years ago it was 150,000; today it is almost 800,000. Twenty-five years from now it is expected to exceed 2 million. Almost half of its working force is employed by the federal government.

Plans for state-local cooperation in the establishment of technical colleges were announced by the State Board of Technical Education in December 1964. The Northern Virginia Planning and Development Commission, a group previously established by the seven jurisdictions, immediately appropriated $5,000 for a study of the need. The governing bodies of the seven jurisdictions all passed resolutions in January 1965, pledging support. Based upon these, the application from Northern Virginia was approved by the State Board early in February. Representatives of the seven jurisdictions met in February and agreed upon the composition of a local Board of Trustees. Each governing body made its appointments, and the newly appointed Board met with the State Director of Technical Education, Dr. Dana Hamel, in a day-long session on March 20, 1965. It was agreed that an effort would be made to get Nova Tech under way in September.

Dr. Joy is Assistant to the Director, Research Program, Development and Evaluation, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Northern Virginia Technical College, Baileys Crossroads, Virginia.

During the next month, the Board's site and facilities committee found and made arrangements for temporary quarters. The Board's budget and personnel committee arranged for Board interviews with four presidential candidates; Robert McKee was selected. The Board's curriculum and community relations committee arranged a meeting with directors of guidance from the 34 high schools in the area and recommended the selection of seven technical programs for inclusion in the curriculum. State approval of facilities, president, and curriculum was obtained by May 1, and printed announcements of the program were delivered to the high schools on May 17, the day when President McKee reported for duty.

During this period, regular reports were made to the seven governing bodies, and each, in its budget, approved its share of $100,000 for Nova Tech's operation in 1965-66.

Careful planning and excellent state cooperation resulted in having faculty, equipment, books, and other instructional materials on hand when more than 500 individually counseled students undertook their college program on September 20. An evening and part-time program was developed, and the winter quarter enrollment was the equivalent of 800 full-time students.

This unbelievable success story resulted from several circumstances other than sheer luck in finding temporary quarters and a well-qualified president so quickly. They were:

1. The cooperating jurisdictions had long discussed the need for post-high-school education, and public opinion was favorable.

2. The public school systems were aware of the need and gave their full support.

3. The state Board and the State Director wanted to show some results in the first biennium and gave top priority to facilitating the operation of its first "baby."

4. Nova Tech's Board of Trustees and President were audacious in laying out the jobs to be done and in getting them accomplished.

The fiscal arrangements for the first year worked well. They were:

1. Tuition of $45 per quarter for full-time students.

2. Payment by local jurisdictions of costs involved in providing facilities, and one-half the costs of operation and nonprofessional personnel salaries.

3. Purchase of equipment with state funds and state payment of professional salaries, and one-half of nonprofessional salaries and operational costs.

The localities pledged the support necessary to have Nova Tech in operation on a permanent site in the fall of 1967. A 77-acre centrally located site has been purchased with $550,000 additional appropriations from the local jurisdictions and matching funds from federal sources. The governing bodies have agreed to offer bond referendums in November to defray the costs of buildings to accommodate 3,000 students.

A progress report one year after the establishment of a local board is dangerous because so much remains to be done. I assume that the story of Nova Tech was included in this program to prove that the difficulties of local-state-federal partnership in the financing of educational programs are not insurmountable. We at Nova Tech are aware of the difficulties but emphasize that "if there is a will there is a way." Success will be the reward of those who view difficulties as a challenge rather than a barrier.

The Cost of Compliance with the Spirit and Letter of Federal Programs

Benjamin C. Willis

IN PREPARING my remarks for this program I studied the title given to me. It is worth repeating: "the *cost* of *compliance* with the *spirit* and *letter* of federal programs." It is a provocative topic as stated, and I do not for a moment assume that it was assigned to me by lot, except as it has been my lot to have gained a certain amount of attention because of an incident last fall related to the general spirit, if not letter, of my present topic. Had it all been an international situation, I am sure such words as *confrontation* and *eyeball to eyeball* would have been used. I am sure some of my friends across the nation said to themselves, "He is never on the sidelines," but you might be surprised to know how many long-distance calls of reassurance I received. An issue was presented in clear-cut fashion. It is the issue at the core of the spirit of the topic in this meeting.

Probably the *letter* of my topic should lead me to some statements of loss and cost, of increased accounting charges, some of which always come out of the pocket of the recipient of funds, or of other experiences translated into dollars and cents. However, financing and accounting are for the use and benefit of people, and it is mainly in terms of people that I plan to talk. Cost or price is not limited to greenbacks and copper quarters. An activity can cost us time; and we can pay a price in terms of proportion or emphasis, human values or goals. We can pay a price, too, in the wear and tear on the nervous systems of our staff members on whom these pressures converge on top of the normal pressures.

School and Community

So let us consider our principles, our purposes, and our highly particularized social responsibilities. My text is sober, perhaps even somber. I know my ideas are somber, although my attitude is hopeful, and my expectations absolutely cheerful.

To start: We have a responsibility for all children enrolled in school. We are expected, and attempt, to give the best educational experience to each child according to his need. Obviously some children require more of us than others do in ways which will compensate for their cultural deficiencies as dictated by standards of the society in which we live. We must be sure, never-

---

Dr. Willis is General Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, Illinois.

theless, that the children who do *not* qualify for federal aid (or more exactly the schools which do not qualify for aid) pay no cost for the compensatory education required by some.

The purpose of education is not to bring the lower half up to a median or mean, aside from the fact that this would be statistically impossible. We do not strive for some universal mediocrity or look to the day when all will be equal because some have been held back through neglect. Our principles require us to help each child to reach and to attain. Our principles also require us to consider practical applications of management.

One such matter of practical management pertains to the idea contained in the phrase *community school,* or conversely, *school community.*

It is worth recalling the symbolic meaning of Section 16. No doubt someone has computed the total land gift to public education represented by all Section 16's in each township in each county in each state. I did not research this because we do not need acreage to imagine the composite extent, and so value, of this aggregate gift. The significant and unique point is that this gift was conferred locally. It was not a lump acreage gift to the state. Public education was by implication to be a local asset—within physical reach of everyone.

I am not prepared to say that this decentralization of the ownership of the land heritage for public education was the origin of our community-school concept, but the idea offers an interesting speculation. For the truth is there is a strong sense in this country of the community's interest in the school and of the school as a reflection of the community. For example, Chicago is certainly not the nation, but even in Chicago the schools cannot be administered solely from our central office. Even a unit as small geographically — 224 square miles — proportionately to the 50 states, cannot be handled in all particulars as if it were homogeneous and equal at the starting line. Do Alaska and Illinois have the same needs or circumstances? I doubt it. In fact, I know it is not so. Not even Fairbanks and Chicago can be expected to need or to perform on an identical pattern. Perhaps as to school population two areas might be entitled to identical sums of money. How each might use the money could differ to the point of oppositeness. Yet each could be fulfilling the spirit of the legislation providing the funds.

The high-school community relationship differs from the elementary-school community relationship only as to area, not as to the spirit of the relationship or as to the focus of interest.

The well known phrase, *"our* school," is expressive of all that I have been trying to impart. Let us not lose that. And let us recall that the equivalent phrase to describe the national government is "it" or "they." *They* has never yet meant *us.*

Administrative Relationships

Quite some years ago all intimacy disappeared between the local governing unit and the national governing unit. The ballot is still here, and more nearly universally used than in the days of the founding fathers, who were too knowledgeable to spell out chapter and verse in our basic documents.

Today in Washington we have bureau added to bureau, each with ever changing guidelines and regulations which become immutable and still as stone right out of the typewriter. There is little allowance even for typographical error.

Now, this is no reflection on the men and women involved in the bureaus. I, for one, can understand their sense of security with regulations and their sense of insecurity when faced with irregularities from the norm. I can even sympathize with their craving for the security of statistics and conformity to the pattern. It is a craving we all have, but unfortunately in the business of education, it remains an unrealized luxury.

And with each act comes a bureau; with each bureau, chiefs and Indians. They often fail to communicate with each other despite their proliferation of regulations sent to us. Even before George the Computer we are being computerized. This is and will be a great loss. A premium is placed upon creativity and innovation and both are dehydrated by the shackles of the exemplary proposal concept.

In this respect it is important to note that many colleges have full-time Washington representatives today, and that school systems, such as ours, feel the obligation to have one person of high rank whose sole responsibility is to bird-dog legislation and analyze its results. Other staff members create and write the projects or proposals. I find it difficult to believe that an employee in a Washington bureau whose knowledge of Chicago is what he can see from the Hilton Hotel can judge what we need in public education in Chicago better than our able and high-level career professionals. We, too, do not have total wisdom, but we do know how schools work.

For a short while the federal bureaucracy dealing with education grew much faster than the state bureaucracy. Today it is different; the state enabling legislation has drawn abreast of the national, if, indeed, the state has not pulled ahead. The federal and state units are thus growing in numbers of personnel more rapidly proportionately than are the school administrative units. Some day soon at a conference like this, someone may be asked to speak on the topic, "Here are the Chiefs. Where are the Indians?"

Conclusion

A major problem is the personal bias of each impersonal "they" and the impossibility of dictating good programs through universal directives. Variations of Parkinson's Law provide other problems. Parkinson dealt with inflationary effects on nonmonetary matters in the main, despite his dictum that expense rises with income. He also pointed out in his first book that if you do not give a man something important to do, he will make important what you give him to do.

I wish to conclude with that, for it seems to me to be at the nub. A great many of us school personnel—now called educationalists as if we did not deal primarily with substantive matter—are worried. We are worrying about our main charge, the equal educational opportunity of *all* children as to need; about the limits of our collective energy to be spent on main problems or minute regulations; about time; and about concepts embodied in Section 16.

We joke about giving Manhattan back to the Indians. May we never reach the point when the parallel joke becomes a reality and we will be required to give education back to the residents of townships surrounding Section 16 for them to have a sense of participation in the education of their children.

The Cost of Compliance with the Spirit and Letter of Federal Programs

Jarvis Barnes

THE COST OF COMPLIANCE with the spirit and letter of the federal programs involves more than is apparent or than has been directly written into the programs. The activities which involve related cost are planning, organizing, directing, evaluating, and reporting. Time and energy of regular personnel are devoted to these activities in order to integrate the activities of the federal programs into the regular ongoing programs of the school system. A request for federal aid carries the commensurate responsibility that the design, organization, and operation of the proposed program will promote the over-all instructional program and, consequently, not be an isolate of special activities.

Compliance with the spirit and letter of federal programs connotes that the local educational agencies applying for federal aid have assumed the responsibility of interpreting the intent of the law and have designed a program which will meet the provisions, stated and implied. In so designing, the local educational agency has control of the proposed program and the activities which will occur as well as the responsibility to comply. The proposer, in designing such a program, becomes involved in theory and practice. In regard to theory, he is concerned with "what is"; and in regard to practice, with "what ought to be"—how best to accomplish an orderly worthwhile program. He is concerned with advancing education on the local level, and more broadly, on the national level.

Comprehensive planning is the foundation of an effective program. Time and energy devoted to planning are costly. Representatives of various educational and community organizations become involved, each analyzing the spirit and intent of the law, each determining the effects of the proposed activities on the operations of his organization and each determining the contributions which the operations of his organization might make toward effectuation of success in the proposed endeavor. When these analyses result in a master plan in which the proposed program is viewed as an integral part, unity in the entire operation of the local educational agency and probable success of the proposed program are advanced. The unmet needs are identi-

---

Dr. Barnes is Assistant Superintendent for Research and Development, Atlanta Public Schools, Atlanta, Georgia.

fied, and the proposed program becomes a vehicle for fulfilling a portion of these needs.

During the planning process the local agency determines the appropriate sources for funding the resulting master program, the portions which might best be funded by local, state, federal, or private revenue, or a combination of these sources. Even though certain federal laws provide for planning, much of the cost of developing the basic idea must be borne by the local educational agency prior to submitting the initial proposal to the appropriate federal agency for consideration. Thus, the initial cost to comply with the spirit and letter of the federal programs includes local expenditures for (a) maintaining up-to-date knowledge of the provisions and possibilities of the many existing laws; (b) developing the compatibility of the proposed idea with these laws, state and federal, and with the objectives of the local instructional program; and (c) extending the imagination and creativity of the planning participants in order that the resulting master plan, and the proposed idea, be innovative and exemplary.

A local agency needs to have time and resources available during the planning stage. A staff member whose primary responsibility is to review legislative provisions is an asset to the local agency. A literature analyst whose chief responsibility is to review related literature, research, and promising practices will also be an asset. A research associate trained in developing evaluative procedures and statistical designs will be another asset. Then, a proposal developer, who has sufficient time and who is skilled in group dynamics will be a catalyst for promoting the development of an idea into a comprehensive, concise program with unity. Because securing funds depends on recommendations of reviewers, a proficient editor might make the difference between having the proposal funded and having it rejected. Internal consistency with the purpose, objectives, procedures, and evaluation clearly and concisely stated is essential for successful funding.

In addition to the cost of the previously mentioned personnel and services, the local educational agency will have expenditures of communication incurred during planning. Various modes of communication will be involved. Because many of the proposals are approved or rejected at the national level, visits and telephone calls with federal staff members are advisable in order for the local representative to gain further insight into the spirit and letter of the federal provisions and into published guidelines. The degree of probable compliance analyzed during these communications will possibly save future time and expense.

Even careful planning does not assure that the proposal will be funded. However, rejection of the proposal does not mean that all of the incurred expenditure by the local educational agency has been in vain. The agency will profit because of new relationships formed, ideas advanced, and educational growth on the part of the planners. These benefits will tend to promote successful designing of subsequent proposals and in operating the regular programs.

A local educational agency will need to be prepared to bear a part of the cost of implementation of funded proposals. Even though federal legislation has provisions for directly related program cost, and some have provisions for indirectly related cost, successful implementation requires expenditures for services for which expenditures are not permitted. Supportive and indirectly related personnel are required to devote energy and time to the implementation of any new program. The additional activities require the supportive and indirectly related personnel to assume additional responsibilities, to counsel with directly related personnel, and to assume a general over-all view of the activities. These efforts are necessary to assure that new activities are not implemented in isolation. Unless certain safeguards are established, supportive and indirectly related personnel might easily channel a disproportionate amount of time and energy from their general responsibilities to those related to successful implementation of the new activities.

The accumulative effect of part-time positions established in new programs might tend to be detrimental in successful implementation of new programs. Generally, the provisions of federal legislation require that there be maintenance of local effort. Consequently, certain personnel requirements of new activities are not sufficient to warrant completely financing the salaries of certain new employees under the proposed new program. If the services of a part-time employee are provided by federal funds, the remaining portion of the services must be provided by local effort. Then, if under a subsequent program the services of a similar part-time employee are needed, the remaining portion of the existing employee's time, which is paid by the local system, is questionable as far as being eligible for inclusion under the new program because of the requirement to maintain local effort.

Consultative services are important during the planning and operational stages. If a planning grant has not been secured, these consultative services must be borne by the local agency. Identification of consultants during the operational phase is difficult, if not unwise, particularly when securing of funds is problematic. The inclusion in proposals of identity of consultants means securing prior commitment. The schedule for using consultants during the operational phase is generally tentative. Nationally known authorities are not willing, and should not be requested, to make commitments prior to the funding of the program.

During the operational phase of the new program many "dual" activities are necessary. The accounting system for special programs must be separate to meet the requirements of the legislation as well as the needs of the auditors. However, this does not mean that the entire operation of the program should be separate. It means just the opposite: In the local schools the operation should be a part of the regular program, but the necessary expenditures should be appropriately coded and identified for accounting purposes.

Two significant features often hamper implementation: lack of physical space to house the operational services and lack of appropriately trained personnel. The cost of arranging for physical space should be carefully and adequately studied during the planning stage and included in the project budget. The availability of specialized personnel required to carry out the program should be investigated. Sufficient recruitment time should be provided in the schedule of implementing the activities.

Budgets for new programs should be realistic. This is difficult to obtain, particularly when certain indications of possible allocations are rather restrictive. Nevertheless, the extensiveness of the program should be the basis of the budget instead of a previously determined arbitrary amount. Sometimes this restriction is such as to make it impossible for the local educational agency to comply with the letter and the spirit of the legislation, much less provide services which are essential for successful operation.

Evaluative procedures should be clearly and comprehensively described in proposals. The extent of use of the regular personnel and existing data should be recognized. The development of a data bank in systems which have access to data processing will tend to promote successful evaluative procedures, save time, and provide for more analytical techniques. Supportive personnel not included in the program are generally required in the gathering of data. Professional assistance generally must be secured, either by contractual services or by employment of research assistants. But employment of research assistants is difficult because of the scarcity of trained individuals.

Dissemination of the findings is a prerequisite to compliance with the letter and the spirit of federal programs. The contributions which the particular program makes to education should be known to others interested in similar programs. Again, much experience in this phase of the program becomes a responsibility of the local system because of the necessity of involving regular personnel and utilizing existing services to disseminate the information.

The cost of compliance with the letter and spirit of federal programs goes beyond the immediate activities. Of course, this should not be viewed as being undesirable. Desirable administrative practices insure that the many activities in a school system will be properly coordinated and that the operation will not be a series of unrelated activities. Educational funds, as provided by the federal legislation, are means for local educational agencies to concentrate on filling certain needs for which funds have not been available. Any new program financed from local, state, or federal funds will require understanding and assistance from key personnel who are not directly involved in the operational phase. The result should be a significant contribution to education in an innovative and exemplary manner.

The burden to comply with the spirit and intent of legislation is that of the administrator of the local educational agency. It is he who, from the inception of the idea, has the responsibility to be familiar with the requirements of the legislation, the needs of the local system, and the cost to administer an educational program. An administrator should not undertake the implementation of a federally financed program without being fully aware of local expenditures needed to accompany the federal expenditures in order to operate a successful program.

The Impact of Federal Government on Texas Junior Colleges

James Reynolds

CURRENTLY, there are 52 junior colleges in Texas, including five in the process of organization. Thirty-eight are public junior colleges; 14 are non-public. This report, however, is based on the 30 public junior colleges which have been in existence for four or more years. The decision to observe this delimitation of the total number of junior colleges was entirely arbitrary. It is believed, though, that answers to the question of the impact of the federal government on junior colleges in Texas will be reflected accurately by conditions in the 30 colleges which were selected.

The data on which the study is based were obtained primarily from two sources: (a) a questionnaire circulated among the 30 public junior colleges, and (b) reports obtained from the files of the Coordinating Board of Higher Education. Replies were received from 22 of the public junior colleges to which the questionnaire was sent. No consistent effort has been made in reporting conclusions to designate which set of data was used for each conclusion.

The data secured from the two sources were, in the main, based on the last three years. During this period only one new junior college was created. The ages of the 30 junior colleges supplying the data varied from four to 45 years.

The growth of junior colleges in Texas, when related to the initiation of new institutions, has followed a very interesting pattern. Increases in the number of new institutions have come in spurts, and have not followed a steady, regular, year-by-year increase. To illustrate this point: It will be observed that 26 of the 38 public junior colleges referred to in the opening paragraphs came into existence in three four-year periods: 10 in 1924-1927, 10 in 1946-1949, and six in 1964-1967. It is interesting that these four-year intervals are spaced roughly about 20 years apart.

This record of the increase in the public junior colleges in Texas suggests the hypothesis that the greatest factor of impact has been local. News of the impending establishment of junior colleges is disseminated. Leadership groups in localities, other than the one involved with the new junior college, become interested in what is being done elsewhere and investigate

---

Dr. Reynolds is Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, College of Education, University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

the possibilities of establishing junior colleges in their own communities. This paper, however, is not concerned with impacts generally, but on the particular impact of the federal government on junior colleges in Texas. For this reason, this interesting hypothesis concerning the impact of local leadership groups will not be pursued further.

Before leaving this aspect of impact, however, it should be observed that there is no evidence directly relating the federal impact to the matter of creating new junior colleges. There may be an indirect influence in that promoters of new junior colleges possibly take into consideration the availability of federal funds as one of the sources of financing the planned institution. This possibility was not investigated.

If attention is turned directly to the federal impact, it seems appropriate to consider some data concerning financial aspects of the junior colleges. First consideration is given to the ratio of federal funds to total income.

The total income of the 30 public junior colleges in 1963 (tuition, local taxes, state subsidy, and federal grants) was $27,025,834. This increased 8.1 percent to a total of $29,225,379 in 1964. In 1965, the total income was $37,445,521, an increase of 28.1 percent over 1964.

Federal grants to the junior colleges for this period were: 1963, $806,208; 1964, $1,280,379; 1965, $1,622,303.

The 1964 grant represented an increase of 58.8 percent over 1963; the grant for 1965, an increase of 26.7 percent over 1964.

In 1963, federal grants accounted for 2.98 percent of the total income of the 30 junior colleges. In 1964, the percentage increased to 4.38; but in 1965, it dropped back slightly to 4.33.

On the basis of the figures for this three-year period, one species of impact becomes abundantly evident: Junior colleges in Texas are likely to continue to rely on federal financial grants for a portion of their total income.

A second impact is suggested by the evidence, although in the case of this second influence supporting data are far from conclusive. This impact concerns the increasing portion of the total junior-college income derived from federal sources. Currently, the short period of time involved in the study—three years—and the fact that the percentage that federal funds are of the total income actually dropped when comparing the third year with the second permits only the most cautious of positions in suggesting the second possible impact, that federal funds will support approximately 5 percent of the budget.

It would be a mistake to conjecture that the percentage the federal aid is of the total income is approximately the same for each of the 30 junior colleges. The fact is that the percentages for the junior colleges vary sharply in each of the three years. The range between the smallest percentage and the largest for each of the three years is from none to 7.88 in 1963, from none to 11.00 in 1964, and from none to 10.60 in 1965. Moreover, five junior colleges in 1963 received no federal funds, one received no funds in 1964, and three received no funds in 1965. Incidentally, one junior college has received no funds in 1963, 1964, or 1965. So far, its record is completely clear on this point.

Since there would be an obvious relationship between the proportion of federal funds to total income in each of 30 junior colleges and the degree of federal impact experienced, the percentages of federal assistance to total income was arranged in rank order for each of the three years. Rank orders were then arbitrarily divided into three groups: (a) highest percentages, (b) middle percentages, and (c) lowest percentages. The classification of junior colleges by membership in one or another of the three groups was then ascertained. This procedure furnished a rough measure of consistency of group membership from year to year.

A high degree of consistency was found among 18 of the 30 colleges. Seven of the 18 appeared regularly among the colleges which received the highest percentage, three in the middle classification, and eight in the lowest percentages. Moreover, in two of the junior colleges, administrative changes owing to death or retirement of the incumbent officer was followed by the percentage of federal funds increasing substantially. It should be noted that no cause-effect relationship is even suggested. It is merely observed that these changes occurred.

With the classification of the junior colleges in groups, the door is opened wide to a more thorough study of some significant questions. Among these questions are: (a) What factors are responsible for 10 of the 30 junior colleges having such records of inconsistency (the two in which administrative changes have taken place were subsequently classified as consistent)? What factors are responsible for eight of the junior colleges ranking consistently low in the percentages (the average percentage for these eight colleges for the three years was 0.72)? Similarly, why do the other 10 colleges consistently rank in the middle or highest classes?

It seems appropriate to infer that the classification of the colleges on this simple scale of consistency-inconsistency bears a direct relationship to the degree of the federal impact on the communities in which the 30 junior colleges are located. This inference was pursued in only a superficial way through comparing the classification of the individual junior colleges on the consistency scale with the factors of enrollment size, age of the institution, and length of tenure of the incumbent chief administrative officer.

No relationship whatever was found in regard to the age of the institution, and in regard to the length of tenure of the chief administrative officer; the two instances described above were the only instances of relationship that could be hypothesized in regard to this factor. There appeared to be a slight relationship between enrollment size and the percentage federal funds were of total income—the largest junior colleges in some instances received the highest percentage—but the exceptions to this were sufficiently numerous to raise serious questions concerning the acceptability of this principle. For example, of the seven largest junior colleges, four were in the highest percentage categories, two in the medium, and one in the lowest. Of the 13 junior colleges in the lowest enrollment classification, three were in the highest percentage category, none in the middle, four in the lowest percentage grouping, and six in the inconsistent group.

A second conclusion possible from this array of classifications is that large junior colleges tend to be more consistent from year to year than do small ones.

Each of these possible inferences from the data, even if a more positive claim for their validity were warranted, are less significant than the influence of a factor which could not be tested: the degree of sympathy for or resistance to the acceptance of federal funds as a legitimate means for financing public junior colleges. This factor could not be tested because of lack of sufficient time, and lack of opportunity for conducting the investigation on the basis of personal visits to the communities involved. It is judged that the necessary subtlety of approach to such an investigation denies the use of any method other than a personal visit.

It is known from personal experience that some resistance to the use of federal funds does exist in all the communities involved. It is not known, however, to what extent this resistance serves as an inhibiting factor. To the extent that it does inhibit, the availability of federal funds produces, probably, a negative impact in that the existence of opportunities for federal assistance, the knowledge that such assistance is accepted in other junior colleges, could intensify the feeling of resistance among those who possess it.

The individual junior colleges were asked several direct questions about the impact of federal assistance on the colleges and on the community in which the college is situated. The questionnaire was much more comprehensive in its request for information related to the many categories of assistance than was true of the records of the Coordinating Board of Higher Education. In the few areas in which there was an overlap in the categories in the data from the two sources, there was, in the main, an agreement in the figures from the two sources. In only one instance was there any substantial disagreement. In this case, one college reported no federal funds from any category while the Coordinating Board records indicated a total of approximately $15,000 had been received from three of the categories.

Some attention will be given subsequently to the impact of the federal government in regard to the grants. Attention is directed now to a summary of the answers to the specific questions.

Specific questions to the individual colleges, other than those related to the several aspects of federal grant programs, were organized to elicit information about four general aspects of possible impact: (a) additional personnel, space, and amount of time required by applications for and receipt of grants; (b) increased services made possible by the grants; (c) impact on the community; and (d) negative factors. Several questions were included under each of the headings.

One question asked junior-college respondents to estimate the amount of time spent per calendar year in performing various aspects of the grants program. The junior colleges which reported estimated a total of 19,181 hours. This amounted to an average of 318 hours per institution, or approximately eight 40-hour weeks per institution.

The aspect of the program taking the largest amount of time was that of making reports with a total, for the junior colleges reporting, of 6,351 hours per calendar year. Administering funds was second with 5,668 hours; making applications was third with 3,660 hours; planning buildings and taking bids accounted for 2,181 hours; selecting student recipients of grants benefits took 800 hours; and supervising construction, 520 hours.

It is recognized that figures, when quoted as these have been, can have a deadening effect on interest. Perhaps it would be better to summarize this federal impact on Texas junior colleges—this impact which has created an enormous responsibility in man-hours of work—with a brief conjecture. If the average number of hours currently spent in each of the six different aspects of the program previously enumerated be multiplied by the total number of junior colleges in Texas, it would take 52 people employed full-time and working on nothing else to do the work necessary.

The college respondents were asked about additional personnel and space required for the various processing activities associated with the grant. Most of those reporting on this question stated that from one part-time clerk to three full-time clerks had been added; that additional office space had to be provided; and in response to the direct question of whether full-time staff members had been added to work on the federal program, two of the colleges indicated that this had been done.

The second major division of questions other than reports on actual funds received dealt with increased services made possible by federal grants. The first question under this section asked for estimates of enrollment increases. Sixteen of the 21 respondents gave a specific answer to this question. One of the 16 indicated that it was questionable as to whether any part of the enrollment increase could be attributed directly to this cause. The remaining 15 believed that some increase had occurred as a result of the federal program. While estimates of the increases were made, it is probable that the lack of clarity of the question may have caused some respondents to report the total enrollment increase occurring during the three years and not to indicate what percent of this increase was due to federal programs.

Increases in enrollment directly attributable to the federal impact on the junior colleges obviously would result from either one or both of two general causes: (a) direct grants to students in the form of certain subsidies or special loan programs, and (b) improvement and expansion of the educational program, including dormitory facilities. Both of these causes are present in the operation of the Texas junior colleges.

Under the first category of causes, direct grants and special loan programs, Texas junior college respondents reported some seven different sources of federal grants: (a) tuition assistance, Department of Defense Appropriation Act; (b) off-duty education (Navy); (c) off-duty education (Marines); (d) work-study programs, Public Law 88-452; (e) U. S. loan program for Cuban students, Public Law 87-519; (f) Manpower development and training, Manpower Development and Training Act; and (g) vocational rehabilitation, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 1954. The combined grants for all the junior colleges for this three-year period amounted to approximately $1,119,000.

As would be expected, not all of the junior colleges reported receiving funds in each of these seven programs. On the basis of colleges reporting, the vocational rehabilitation program was most popular, being named by 15 of the 22 institutions reporting. The work-study program was second, being named by 12 of the colleges. There was a sharp drop-off after second place.

On the basis of funds received, however, the manpower development and training program was first with a total of $437,000 from four colleges. Other programs ranked on the basis of the total received (figures in parentheses represent the number of colleges reporting) were: work-study program (12) $412,000; tuition assistance, Department of Defense (6) $179,000; vocational rehabilitation (15) $78,000; off-duty education (Navy) (1) $8,900;

loan program for Cuban students (2) $4,000; and off-duty education (Marines) (1) $250.

The second category of general causes—improvement and expansion of the educational program including dormitory facilities—was reported by the junior colleges to come from six categories of federal grants; (a) nuclear equipment grants, Atomic Energy Act; (b) higher education facilities, Public Law 88-204; (c) equipment and minor remodeling, NDEA Title III; (d) vocational and technical education, Smith-Hughes, George-Barden and other legislation; (e) college housing program, Housing Acts of 1950, 1957; and (f) institutional science programs, NSF, Public Law 507.

If the junior colleges are ranked on the frequency of their reporting federal sources, three programs rank high: vocational and technical education, 18 colleges; equipment and minor remodeling, 17 colleges; and higher education facilities, 14 colleges. The drop-off in the number of colleges is sharp after the third place, dropping to three, two, and one.

When the colleges are ranked on the total funds received (which in the case of higher education facilities program includes applications), the rankings change. The higher education facilities program is first with a total of $5,328,000; vocational and technical education, second, with $2,144,000. The other four places in the order of the total amount received and with the number of schools reporting are college housing programs, (3) $1,161,000; equipment and minor remodeling (17) $388,000; nuclear equipment grants (1) $9,000; and institutional science programs (2) $5,500.

Two other federal programs have contributed to the educational service of the junior colleges. Since they were less directly related to enrollment increases, however, than the two general causes previouly described, they were considered separately. These are guidance and counseling, NDEA Title Va; NSF fellowships and trainerships, and research participation and scientific activities for teachers, NSF.

Reports were fragmentary in regard to these items. One junior college reported faculty member participation in NSF programs and the receipt by the participants of $22,900; and two colleges reported funds for research participation for teachers amounting to $2,600.

There is no question that the federal impact on Texas junior colleges may be observed in the number of new buildings already on the campus, in the process of construction, or on the drawing boards. Fifteen colleges reported a total of 31 buildings classifiable under the previous description. Ranked in order of their frequency, the buildings are science, seven; technical, six; library, five; classroom and dormitory, four each; physical education, two; and business, fine arts, and student center, one each.

In a consideration of the buildings made possible through federal assistance grants, two aspects of the federal impact are not immediately obvious. One of these is the stimulation given to technical education.

State laws providing subsidies for public junior colleges have not been favorable to the development of programs of technical education. As a consequence, these programs have lagged. With the greater use of federal funds for technical education, though, and the use of such funds for buildings, this curriculum deficiency is being overcome in many junior colleges.

The second of the less obvious results of the federal impact is the construction of dormitories on several of the junior-college campuses. Cynics might observe that this enhances the quality of the inter-collegiate athletic programs. Actually, the construction of such dormitories extends the service areas of the colleges, and equalizes educational opportunities for many youths in sparsely populated areas.

Sixteen of the 22 junior colleges reporting believed that the impact of the federal government actually improved the image of the junior college in the community. Only two reported no discernible improvement.

Some junior colleges reported a reaction against federal control accompanying federal aid, some distortion of long-range plans, and some slighting of the importance of unsubsidized programs. While the number of such reports was small, they cannot be dismissed because in the communities represented, these reports represent genuine negative qualities of the federal impact.

Federal assistance grants to junior colleges can no longer be regarded as temporary emergency activities, if they ever were, which will cease to exist. They have become hard realities. Some Texas junior colleges have not participated in federal programs for reasons which are perfectly valid for them. The preponderant majority of the institutions have participated, and are continuing to do so. For them, federal assistance has become a definite part of their budgetary calculations. They have experienced the expenditure of substantial amounts of time in connection with their grants, have employed additional staff, and have added office space. Their enrollments have increased in part from direct grants and in part from broadened programs, improved facilities, additional buildings, and increased service. They have moved more definitely into the field of technical education and have expanded their service area. While most agree that their public image has improved, some recognize certain negative features regarding the impact.

For both groups, the participating and the nonparticipating, there has been a perceptible impact. What will the future impact be? There is only one answer to this question, *Quien sabe?*

The Impact of Federal Funds on Junior Colleges in Florida

James L. Wattenbarger

SEVERAL YEARS AGO, I made a speech at a national meeting which was entitled "The Impact of Federal Programs on the Financing of Junior Colleges." It was most interesting for me to look back over that speech and to compare what I had to say at that time with what I will want to say today. The final statement in that speech was:

> In summary, I would point out that the impact of federal programs upon the financing of junior colleges up to the present time has been entirely an indirect one. Since the junior colleges are specifically oriented toward their local communities and highly value their local control, I would suspect that this impact likely would continue to be indirect for some time to come.

This speech was made before any of the legislation providing funds directly for higher education had been passed by Congress, and there were only a few states in which junior colleges had participated to any great extent in the recently passed National Defense Education Act. Florida was one of those states that had been using NDEA funds in its junior college programs in a number of ways, even when I made this first speech.

Since that time, there have been many changes in federal support for educational programs, and the emphasis of the national legislation upon education at the elementary, the secondary, and the higher education levels has changed a great deal.

During recent years, there have been two specific developments in economics and public finance which have affected the support of education: (a) the economic and social benefits of education as they may be related to the optimum expenditure for education, and (b) the trends in public finance which have influenced the support patterns for community junior-college education in the United States.

Economists and experts in school finance have conducted research studies over the past few years which have illustrated quite conclusively that there is a definite connection between education and social and economic improvement. These benefits are not limited to a single area of a state, to a single state, or to the nation. The consequences of education have assumed a global nature. The need for employees in various types of technical jobs and the improvement of transportation have encouraged movement of population not only within national boundaries, but also across them.

Dr. Wattenbarger is Director of the Division of Community Junior Colleges, Florida State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida.

An obvious implication of these facts for a community junior-college administrator is that education at this level must be developed not only for those who now are participating, but also for a continually increasing number of persons. The curriculum must include a variety of occupational offerings, not only for economic reasons, but also for the personal reasons of each individual. The concept of community-centered programs must be considered in a much wider context.

The economic benefits of education are not reaped solely by the individual, however. In fact, a number of writers have maintained that educational opportunity is a critical factor in national security. Many writers contend that federal aid to education is an absolute national necessity. They maintain, also, that the cost of education must be divorced from the family capacity to pay and the social position of the family. This conclusion is reached on the basis of the assertion that a social good as well as an individual good is received from opportunity for education.

The concern evidenced in the United States a few years back when it was concluded that Russia's education system was producing more engineers than our system is an example of the way national welfare is brought into the educational decisions. These facts negate the frequently propounded arguments that education is of benefit to the individual and, therefore, he should pay for it. (The fact that he will pay through taxation is not considered in this argument.)

It is important to economic stability and progress as well as to national security to develop opportunities widely available and of low cost to the student. An implication is that community junior-college boards should keep fees low or eliminate them entirely. The development of scholarship funds also becomes an important interpretation of public policy. The concern of economists for student's foregone earnings during the period of his education have become a part of the estimates of the total cost of education.

Another conclusion often reached by economists concerns the individual character of the benefits of education. No one can exclude the nonstudents from achieving sizable gains from expenditures for education. It has become a national policy to use education to break the cycle of poverty and overcome the lack of motivation among low-income groups. Therefore, education is not a commodity which can be sold at market prices to those who receive the benefits directly. The importance of encouraging all persons to take advantage of education becomes a major consideration.

In the practice of public finance, taxation of individuals must be based on broad general principles of public good and not on the basis of an exact determination of the direct dividends received. Determining the optimum expenditure for education is a political process through which the claims for resources for education can be evaluated against the claims for other public services. These assumptions lead to the conclusion that general taxation for improved education opportunities will result in benefits for everyone, both the student and the nonstudent.

In summary, I would point out that the implications of these studies are:

1. That post-high-school education must be made available to all who can benefit from it

2. That curriculum must not be based solely on local considerations

3. That there is continued need for courses which improve communication between people

4. That fees should be kept low or even eliminated when possible

5. That factors which encourage attendance should be given careful attention

6. That general taxation is the sound basis for financing post-high-school education.

The second major heading mentioned earlier concerns the trends of public finance which may be related to support for community junior-college education. This is the point where a great deal has happened which would change my remarks from those I made a few years ago in this regard. In the various states, several different methods for support of public education have developed recently. The public community junior college is an outstanding illustration of the variety of these differences.

Typically, the community junior college has been started under local support. In this respect, the support for the community junior college has been more nearly similar to the support for grades 1-12 than to the support for colleges and universities. However, more recently a wide variety of support patterns has been developed and some of the new developments in public finance have had a specific and direct impact upon public community junior-college support.

Local taxation typically has been a real and personal property tax. The principal basis for state taxation has been sales taxes and other use taxes. Federal income typically has been derived from income taxes and special use taxes. Local support has been used to provide funds for operating and capital outlay expenditures. State funds have been used in both ways, typically, first as a part of current operating expenses and then recently for capital outlay expenditures. Federal support has been limited in great measure to direct grants-in-aid for specific purposes. These grants-in-aid often have been rationalized on the basis of national requirements for defense.

Recent developments, however, appear to support a change in the amount of support and source of support from these three levels of government. Increased attention currently is found in state support supplemented by federally allocated funds. The federal funds have begun to move away from specific grants-in-aid to other types of general support. Some of the concern which we may have in connection with this trend are emphasized in the following questions:

1. *Does a change in local source of support reduce local control?* Since junior colleges typically are locally controlled, locally oriented, and locally operated, they have claimed a great deal of authority in institutional independence. To receive funds from an entirely different source may reduce these local preferences. An example may help to clarify what I mean: Recently, a county-supported institution in one of our states decided that it would curb expenditures by eliminating enrollment of students who lived outside the county. Since this institution was a recipient of federal funds, the newspaper editor of an adjacent county wrote to Washington to inquire whether the county board had the right to make this decision. The question still is unanswered, but I am sure you will see the implications involved.

2. *Will increased support from state and federal sources provide additional funds or merely replace local funds?* The increased gross national product and a resulting increase in income which is received both by individuals and by the nation as a whole have not increased local support for education.

Studies carried out in many places in the country have indicated that there is not a direct relationship between increased income and increased local expenditures for education. Now then, are total expenditures for education to be raised in line with the increasing cost of operating educational institutions in the time of rising income? Is this to be done by maintaining the same level of local support and increasing the state support? Is it to be done by maintaining the same level of local and state support and increasing federal support, and if so, what implication does this have for the responsibility of the college or other institution to provide programs equally beneficial to students who live 2,000 miles away as they are for students who live in the immediate vicinity?

3. *Do sources of support patterns force "efficiency" or other "desirable improvements" in education?* The problems of small administrative units have been alleviated in great measure by the formation of larger districts. Should money be used as a weapon to force reluctant localities to do what they should do anyway? The district problem has been a particularly important one for community junior colleges. Efficient units have not been possible in many states where regular school districts have been used as a basis for support. In states, such as California where there is a long history of junior-college development, recent district reorganization has been encouraged by state law and regulations. This enlargement has been accomplished by combining small junior-college districts into larger districts. States, such as Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, and Illinois, have experienced recent pressure to develop larger junior-college districts. Florida, in outlining its basic community college plans, immediately faced the problem associated with small districts and provided for larger districts, which in this instance, meant combinations of counties rather than combinations of small school districts. In a few states, reluctance to add any more education to local support responsibilities has resulted in the largest district of all, an entire state. Some new community junior colleges have been set up with their total support coming from the state.

Another result of the changes in sources of income is shown in studies which indicate that there is a persistently higher total expenditure for education as sources of income move away from the local area. The fact that state support raises the total expenditure to a level above that which will prevail, if local factors alone determined expenditures, is evidence that the external benefits of local education receive consideration in determining the level of support. A larger portion of public school revenues produced by the state is associated with higher levels of total per-capita expenditures. In other words, there is a tendency for expenditures to be higher as state support increases and the cost is spread among all the residents of the state rather than merely those living within the boundaries of a local junior-college district.

Another conclusion reached by some writers in public finance is that the scope and quality of education are to some extent, "expenditure determining" rather than "expenditure determined" and thus constitute a policy variable. In other words, if people are concerned with and interested in the scope and quality of education at the community junior-college level, this concern will determine the optimum level of expenditure rather than any predetermined amount of available money. The scope and quality come first in determining the expenditure made eventually.

With these facts in mind, let us look for a few minutes at some of the results which already have obtained in Florida because of the increased expenditures in federal funds in our junior colleges. In 1963-64, Florida community junior colleges expended less than $.5 million of federal funds in the community junior-college program. As of 1965-66, more than $5.25 million currently is being expended or encumbered to be expended during the current fiscal year. This is an increase of nearly 1,000 percent over this short period of time. Also, it is interesting to note that in 1963-64, the funds came from three pieces of national legislation, while during the current year there are at least 10 different laws which are used as a basis for this support.

Results of increased federal participation in support of community junior colleges might be listed as benefits or deterrents. To make a judgment as to which are benefits and which are deterrents is not appropriate at this point, so I will merely list these in order that you may draw conclusions of your own.

One of the primary results of federal support has been that each college has been forced to employ a person or persons whose full-time job is to work with the federal program. The process of filling out forms, making reports, and identifying sources for obtaining funds from the federal government for grants is a full-time job, even for a small college.

Since we definitely have moved into a position where support for community junior colleges includes funds from the three levels of government—local, state, and federal—budget planning and long-range projections must involve consideration of all these sources. The questions outlined above tend to influence considerations and decisions. Will additional funds replace or supplement previous sources? In a time of rising costs, will additional funds permit enrichment of programs or merely an ability to maintain *status quo?* When dependence upon a source of revenue is repeated in annual budgets year after year, what happens if that source is changed? To what extent is long-range planning soundly based?

It is obvious that vocational funds have stimulated program development to a great extent in the occupational areas. There has been considerably more emphasis on programs in the occupational areas than previously was the case, and colleges now are able to do many things only discussed a few years ago.

The student aid program has been most helpful to individuals and has enabled a number of young people to attend who might not otherwise have had an opportunity. Financial aid for students is much more generally available than before. However, we also have noticed a small trend toward decreasing concern by local organizations for providing student aid. The availability of federal funds has diminished local effort in this area.

The availability of federal funds, accompanied by passage of the Civil Rights Bill, has speeded up the elimination of colleges which serve predominantly or exclusively members of a single race. This is particularly true in the public colleges. At the same time, however, other federal legislation has encouraged and perpetuated some institutions which have served Negro students inadequately. These small, poorly located, and highly inefficient colleges have received new impetus to continue operation, even though in a number of instances they should not.

As a result of some poor planning, which apparently is no one's fault but for which everyone must suffer, there has been a great deal of slippage between the passage of bills and the availability of funds. We have two colleges which have waited over one and a half years for funds under the Higher Education Facilities Act. We have observed much poor administration and can cite specific examples where funds have been wasted. The urgency which sometimes occurs to spend before a specific date causes poor decisions and wasted effort. Deadlines which have been set arbitrarily often are impossible to follow in any sound manner, and have resulted in rushed planning which, more often than not, is poor planning. Budgets constructed upon anticipation of receipts of funds have been carried over into the following fiscal year with great difficulty to everyone. Project proposals have been submitted with no resulting approval or disapproval until two years later when a phone call from Washington informs the applying college that its proposal is about to be approved. By this time, the whole purpose of the project has become modified or changed, or even the need eliminated. The procedures required in obtaining approval seem to require, at times, the same careful cultivation common in requesting grants from foundations. Funds are not made generally available but are aimed at limited purposes which may not be appropriate for an institution. Since money is available, however, the college will try to obtain it.

The federal government's emphasis upon the "deprived" portion of our population has enabled junior colleges to give more than "lip service" to their stated purpose of providing educational opportunity for all. The open-door policy can become a reality for both the undereducated and the underfinanced. The development of remedial programs, the increased concern for occupational education, the ability to provide financial help—all these have resulted from the availability of funds not previously available. Colleges which previously talked now are acting.

Funds for articulation activities have been made available from NDEA and Elementary and Secondary Act funds, and have increased the participation in these activities. This has resulted in improvement of programs in foreign languages, mathematics, and in science in particular. Funds also have made it possible to provide leadership in areas which would not otherwise have been adequately supported. Examples of this are in technical education, guidance and counseling, and research. Funds also have been made available for state-wide studies in the occupations and in curriculum development. There has been opportunity to improve the abilities and the quality of faculty personnel through summer programs, seminars, and conferences.

The misuse of the process of accreditation has created some problems, on the other hand. The laws and/or the interpretation of them that membership in a "voluntary" organization is a basic requirement for eligibility to receive federal funds have placed undue emphasis upon certain types of accreditation. These procedures have placed our regional accrediting associations in untenable positions upon several occasions. Colleges which previously would not have been considered for accreditation by the Association now place unrelenting pressures upon the Association for statements implying approval or at least possible approval. Where accreditation was considered a desirable goal it has, under this pressure, become a necessary entry requirement for continued operation.

There have been some examples of state coordination being hindered by federal legislation, or at least administrative interpretation of the law, that has not recognized the state coordinating body in procedures for apportioning aid to higher education. Institutions have been encouraged, permitted, or required to make requests for funds directly to the U.S. Office of Education rather than through the legally constituted state coordinating agencies. Colleges have been placed in unforgivable competition with each other, sometimes to the detriment of programs in operation.

Some states have not been as fortunate as Florida is in its ability to use federal funds for the community junior colleges. We have seen a number of benefits. The difficulties generally are administrative and very likely could be corrected. The over-all effect is good for the students.

These remarks outline briefly the impact that federal funds have had upon Florida community junior colleges. In closing, let us look back at the earlier points I mentioned and see how federal funding of community junior-college education relates to them.

1. The economic and social benefits of education are recognized in the federal legislation.
    a. A national responsibility for education has been a motivation for federal support.
    b. The need for occupational education reflecting not only local but also state and national requirements has motivated federal support. This is not new, of course, but has been emphasized more during recent years.
    c. The provision of student loans and student work opportunities helps to alleviate financial difficulties.
    d. The purpose of education is helped by federal support.
2. The increased federal support is making possible three sources of income in budget planning.
    a. This federal support has affected curriculum in a number of ways.
    b. The federal support has influenced institutional integrity and not always positively.
    c. The federal support has made the open-door policy more realistically applied.
    d. Federal support has created an entirely new relationship in the use of public funds in private education.
    e. Federal support has affected state coordination.

The inevitability of federal support is firmly established. We now need to seek the best ways to administer it. The three-way partnership of support can provide answers, acceptable answers, to the problems identified by economists and public finance experts. We now need to learn to apply the answers.

A New Look for the State Department of Education—New Hampshire

Paul R. Fillion

STATE DEPARTMENTS of education across the nation are reflections of the way public education is organized in America. Through the years, our total national effort in education has been the sum of the accomplishments of 50 or fewer different state school systems. Some state education agencies have large staffs. There may be 1,000 or more staff members in a single such agency. At the other extreme, some state education agencies have in recent years had scarcely more than one one-hundredth of that many staff members. It is interesting to note the differences among departments in the ratio of professional to nonprofessional staff members. Apparently, some states see the role of the state education agency as one which requires a relatively high proportion of persons with professional competence to give leadership and direction to the educational program of the state. In contrast, other states apparently lean more heavily toward regulatory, accounting, statistical, and fund-disbursing activities, which require a relatively higher proportion of nonprofessional personnel.

Some state education agencies exercise a high degree of control over local schools and school systems. Generally, such states provide a relatively high measure of funds from state sources with which to meet the cost of local school programs. Other states have delegated much decision-making and planning to local school systems.

Certainly, some state departments of education have in the past been a more effective and significant force in bringing about constructive change in education than have others. Even after recognizing this, it seems reasonable to make the generalization that until recent years there has been stability in the role of state education agencies and their capacity to effectively fulfill that role. Here I emphasize that I am attempting to generalize on the total of all state activity across the country over a number of years. This by no means overlooks the fact that in a particular state, in a particular year, there may have been major change in upgrading the state education agency. Through internal reorganization, and through being given increased responsibilities or capabilities, a particular state education agency would then be in a position to make a strikingly increased contribution to education in its state.

Mr. Fillion is Chief of the Division of Administration, New Hampshire State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire.

Such a major change took place in New Hampshire as a result of legislation enacted in 1919. That legislation reflected, in part, the concern felt for the rather poor showing New Hampshire had just made in the proportion of its young men rejected as educationally unfit for military service in World War I. In brief, the 1919 legislation established the present structure for our State Board of Education and our State Department of Education, and framed the major statutory responsibilities for both bodies.

New Hampshire has a seven-member State Board of Education comprised of laymen appointed by the governor and the executive council. The board members serve five-year terms and may be reappointed. One member of the board is designated annually by the governor to serve as chairman. The State Board of Education has sole authority to appoint a commissioner of education as its chief executive officer and secretary. The chief state school officer, our commissioner, serves at the pleasure of the state board for an indefinite term. The staff members of the Department of Education, at all levels, are appointed on the basis of qualifications, and are not subject to indiscriminate dismissal for political or arbitrary reasons.

The 1919 legislation assigned broad powers to the State Board of Education. One sentence of the statute reads as follows:

> The state board shall have the same powers of management, supervision, and direction over all public schools in this state as the directors of a business corporation have over its business, except as otherwise limited by law.

Through the intervening years, however, the legislature has kept under close surveillance the manner in which those broad powers have been discharged. In general, the predominant theme has been one of maintaining considerable latitude for local decision-making.

At this point, I should introduce a brief overview of education in New Hampshire. The 1960 population of the state, according to the federal census was 606,921. The state is enjoying a healthy, but not spectacular population growth. The public-school population in 1960 was 107,736. Our enrollment this year is 131,138. We estimate that by 1975 the public-school enrollment will reach 172,500. New Hampshire has a high proportion of nonpublic-school pupils, with 34,048 pupils enrolled in all nonpublic schools this year.

A major reorganization of local administrative units took place about 1885. During the next 10 years or so, more than 2,300 small school districts were consolidated into about 250 local units. For the most part, these 250 school districts were coterminous with, but politically independent of, local towns or cities. A second effort at reorganization and consolidation of local administrative units was undertaken in 1947. The statute provided complete local option on *when* to reorganize, and very little local option on *how* to reorganize. Little progress was made. Since 1947 the statutes have been made progressively more flexible. As a result, major progress has been made since about 1962. By next July 1, the number of local school districts will have been reduced to 189. Much still needs to be done in this area. Half of the school districts of the state last year had no more than 236 pupils in all 12 grades, on the basis of residence.

County government in New Hampshire does not participate in the educational process at all. Instead we have a unique structure known as the supervisory union. There are presently 43 supervisory unions, each headed by a superintendent of schools, who serves as the superintendent of each of one or more school districts within his union. The superintendent is selected by all of the school-board members of the districts in his supervisory union. He is then elected by the State Board of Education. His contract is with the state board; he is technically a state employee; and is paid by the state treasurer from both state and local funds. I mention this structure because it has proven to be an important factor in keeping our State Department of Education in very close contact with local superintendents, school boards, and schools. I must not, however, digress further from the main theme of this discussion, namely, our department itself.

I joined the New Hampshire Department of Education in September of 1950 as Director of Educational Finance. The department staff then consisted of 30 professional and 23 non-professional persons, not counting 8 in Vocational Rehabilitation and Nurse Education and Registration, activities not directly related to serving elementary and secondary schools. Our department has no immediate responsibility for higher education, except for two-year post-secondary vocational-technical education. By last June, our staff certainly had not been increased greatly. There still were only 30 professional persons, and the number of nonprofessionals had been increased to 28, again not counting Vocational Rehabilitation and Nurse Education. Those groups had grown meanwhile to 15. One startling example of the slow rate of change in the size of our department staff seems worthy of mention. In 1950, there was one generalist in the broad field of elementary education, plus one person serving as a specialist in the fine arts in all grades. The other departmental specialists in instruction and curriculum served solely or primarily in secondary education. As of last June, there still were only those two positions.

The fact that the professional staff remained at 30 for so many years should not be interpreted as complete lack of change. From time to time a new position of specialized assignment was created, but always directly or indirectly as the result of eliminating another position.

Since this group has a particular interest in and concern about financing education, let me summarize the experience of the past 15 years in that area, also. State financial support of local school districts in 1950 amounted to $632,261, or 4.4 percent, of local expenditures for current expenses and debt service. By 1964-65 this amounted to $7,477,374, still only 12.9 percent of the same categories of local expenses.

With this as background, let me now move on to the second portion of this presentation.

The Present—Progress Under Forced Draft

Everywhere, education is a matter of much greater public concern today than it was in past years. State legislatures are giving increased attention to the problems of education in their states. They are examining educational needs and establishing priorities for meeting those needs. Laws are passed which are aimed at the improvement of local school programs. Such laws generally make increased demands on the state department of education. Also enacted are laws which sharpen state department of education responsibilities. Such actions often involve added staff to improve service to local schools. They may or may not involve the disbursement of increased state funds to local school districts. Both the momentum and the resources for the progress to which I refer come entirely from within the state. We need to keep in mind that an important part of the increased vitality presently observable in state departments of education is coming from this type of "home grown" legislative action.

At the same time, we should recognize that a major factor in the increased stature of state departments of education in recent years has been the advent of new federally supported programs. Particularly since the enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, the decisions of Congress with respect to priorities of educational need have been sharply and clearly reflected at the state as well as at the local level. There are differences among these new programs with respect to provisions for administration at the state level. The majority provide some federal money, usually on some matching basis, for state administration. They also provide federal funds that are disbursed through the state education agency to local school systems for specified purposes. A notable exception to this pattern is Title X of the National Defense Education Act. That Title makes federal funds available on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis to state education agencies specifically for strengthening their own programs of statistical services. No funds are available under Title X for general distribution to local school systems.

Titles I and II of Public Law 89-10, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, illustrate the prevailing pattern of federal participation in public education. Funds are available for state administration, and much larger amounts are available for disbursement to local school systems. In sharp contrast to this, no funds whatsoever are available for state education agencies in connection with Title III of the same Act. This, in spite of the fact that state agencies have specific statutory responsibilities and very significant professional leadership responsibilities under provisions of Title III.

In this discussion of the new look for state departments of education, major attention should be given to the impact of Title V of Public Law 89-10. The federal statute states:

> The Commissioner shall carry out . . . a program for making grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States.

Almost $14.5 million has been appropriated for state departments of education in the states and territories for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. The statute provides that for fiscal 1966 and also fiscal 1967, the federal funds be made available without any state matching whatsoever. As of mid-March, all states and territories, except American Samoa, had plans approved and funds granted under this Title. All but 10 states had been granted essentially their full entitlements for this year. Some of those 10 probably will plan to use the balance of their entitlement. As a matter of fact, New Hampshire is one of those 10 and we do intend to program the use of our full entitlement. Plans for this were completed last week. The allocations to states range from approximately $112,000 to just over $1 million for this fiscal year.

Dr. Robert Hopper, Director of the Division of State Agency Cooperation of the U. S. Office of Education, has kindly made available to me a current summary of the various state programs under Title V, so that I could share this summary with you today. The approved state plans call for expanding state departments of education by a national total of approximately 1,050 professional and 770 nonprofessional persons. The areas of expanded effort and capabilities have been classified under 10 major program functions. It is heartening but not surprising to find that about one-fourth of all of this expanded effort has been programmed under the heading, "Study, Planning, Developing, and Evaluating State Educational Programs, and Research Coordination." Almost as much effort has been programmed under the heading, "General Direction and Management of Leadership, Consultative, and Technical Assistance to Local Education Agencies for Improvement of Instruction." The program function given the third highest priority is that of "General Administration," followed next by "Statistics and Data Processing."

The total impact on state education agencies of new state programs and new federal programs, such as I have been discussing for the past few minutes, gives rise to the theme of this portion of my presentation; namely, "Progress Under Forced Draft." Being involved myself in state school administration, I am keenly aware, and a bit sensitive, of the fact that few if any states are properly staffed with talent and manpower specifically assigned to the identification of program areas *not* being served adequately, and to the development of new or expanded programs needed to do the job properly. I am referring, in other words, to a *planning* unit, free of any operating responsibility. Also, many state education agencies must function within a body of laws and governmental regulations which impose a variety of confinements and restrictions on their operation. Of particular pertinence here are restrictions against receiving and spending newly available funds, and restrictions against adding staff personnel to meet unexpected demands for new services. The result is that the staff already available, usually already carrying very full workloads, must do the critical job of getting new programs operational, getting them "on the road," before staff can be hired to operate those programs.

Another aspect of this problem of total impact warrants mention here, too. The competition between education agencies at the local, state, and federal levels for competent personnel to discharge the executive and administrative functions of new programs has reached fantastic proportions. This is paralleled by similar competition for outstanding talent in specialized fields. One need mention only the current demand for specialists in remedial reading, library services, mathematics, and science, to well identify the problem.

In New Hampshire, Public Law 89-10 is making the greatest single impact on our department since the reorganization legislated in 1919. I have referred previously to our very slow rate of expansion in number of staff personnel and in financial assistance to local school districts. I indicated earlier that in the last 15 years, our capacity to serve the elementary and secondary schools of New Hampshire has been strengthened by the addition of only five staff members, all nonprofessional. Under Public Law 89-10 alone, we have been authorized at the state level to add 24 positions: four professional and three nonprofessional positions under Title I; one professional and one nonprofessional position under Title II;

and seven professional and eight nonprofessional positions for various parts of our department program under Title V. To date, only three other positions have been authorized for this year or next year, to serve elementary and secondary schools, as a result of new state-supported programs and all other new federal programs.

Let me inject here the thought that in the New Hampshire Department of Education we believe very strongly that the work of our department is about 90 percent of a leadership nature and about 10 percent of a regulatory nature. That is why I keep equating staff expansion with our increased ability to serve education in our state.

Our experience with Title V is probably typical of the experience of most states throughout the country. We devoted many, many man-hours to analysis of our present department programs and to analysis of staff strengths and weaknesses. We also made a careful and extended assessment of the needs of local school districts that should be more effectively met through assistance from our department. Armed with these analyses, we then determined the areas or program functions into which Title V funds should be channeled in New Hampshire.

The application process itself required compiling masses of information about our present program and our staffing pattern. I suspect that we might have been content to do much less of this kind of self-analysis. In fairness to the Title V staff in the U. S. Office of Education, however, I must add that the work required of us in the application process contributed, I am sure, to better immediate and long-range planning on our part. While some might feel as I do personally, that the application process *could* have been less demanding, I want to repeat for the sake of emphasis that *we* set priorities to our needs. We in New Hampshire decided how Title V funds would be spent in our department. This was true all the way from details of what pieces of furniture and equipment to buy, to the more critical matter of what new professional and nonprofessional positions would be established. As part of this, we decided to go as far as we could this year in buying furniture and equipment, so that we could support a maximum number of new positions next year when the funds available must carry us for a full 12-month period.

Without taking your time to present a lot of detail on the matter, I can summarize our decisions with respect to the use of Title V funds by saying that we have emphasized the 10 program functions in about the same way as have the other states across the country. I should move now to the third and last section of this presentation.

The Future—A New Stature

It has been my privilege during the past 15 years to join representatives from other states in regional or national projects coordinated by the U. S. Office of Education. Because New Hampshire is a relatively small state with a relatively small Department of Education staff, some of us there have occasion to wear a number of different hats. I shall mention two examples because they are activities with far-reaching implications for local-state-federal relations and for the work of state departments of education in the future. For most of those 15 years, I have participated actively in various phases of the Uniform Records and Reports Project. This project provides a vehicle by which all states and many professional organizations are working together, perhaps with varying degrees of enthusiasm, to arrive at a better set of terms and definitions to describe education today. This is an obvious prerequisite to effective identification and treatment of present and future problems in our total educational program.

Also, I am completing my third year as direct representative of my Chief State School Officer on the Committee on Education Data Systems, and as a member of the nine-man Steering Committee of that national committee. This is the duly authorized body charged by the Council of Chief State School Officers to work with the U. S. Office of Education in developing and implementing an effective program for local-state-federal reporting on all aspects of the status of education in America.

While we are all concerned with channeling our energies in various directions besides data collection and handling, as such, it seems to me that there is no other one area of activity that has so many far-reaching implications for the total picture of local-state-federal relations. When I say this, I am particularly sensitive to the one issue which is by far the most critical of all. I refer, of course, to all the direct and indirect ways in which education at the local level is, or might be, molded, influenced, or even controlled by decisions made at the national level. This subject, as such, is largely outside my assignment for today. I do want to express my deep conviction, however, that the matter of local-state-federal statistical reporting is now a much more critical part of the broader issue of where the control of education is to rest than has been the case in years past, and I believe it will become even more so in the future. Unfortunately, time does not permit treating this point as I wish it could be treated.

I am convinced that the next 5 to 10 years will be critical ones for many state departments of education. The present vitality, adaptability, and progress in public education which must be both continued and strengthened are possible only when a state school system can exert strong leadership and provide adequate financial support to local school systems that have opportunity to adjust and adapt to the characteristics of their particular community.

The issues of national strength and social progress are today so great that education will not be permitted to fail to make a critical contribution. The matter at stake is the way in which this will be done. The sterility of innovation and mediocrity of effectiveness which characterize any national educational system lacking in ability to adjust to differences among individual school systems, could be the pattern of the future if education is not strong and dynamic at the state level. I said this *could* be the pattern. I genuinely believe this will not be the case.

Each level of government has an important role to play in contributing to good education for all Americans. There are, however, serious obstacles. Federal legislation enacted to date bears witness to there being much to learn yet in writing and enacting legislation at the national level concerning education. State education departments have many problems to face in the years just ahead. By internal means, and perhaps through such external means as the Governors' Compact for Education, state education agencies must win support for reasonable release from some of the confinements of typical state government. Those confinements may be appropriate for an agency that is largely regulatory. Even more than is true today, however, the state departments of education of the future must be *much* more than merely regulatory.

Some persons serving at the state level in education may need their sights raised on how best to utilize the talents and resources of their department. Even more than today, the major thrust of the future must be in creative leadership, problem solving, and program development.

No one should interpret my discussion of the problems facing state departments of education in the years just ahead as reflecting pessimism about the outcome. I am convinced that the new look for state departments of education is one of providing an even stronger force than is possible today on behalf of good education in each state. Regardless of the imperfection that may exist in legislation enacted today at both the state and national levels, much progress is being made, and will continue to be made at an accelerating pace. The provisions of Title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are already contributing significantly to this progress. Actually, in my discussion today I did not describe even this one resource in full. I deliberately confined my remarks to Section 503 of Title V. Section 505 offers additional and significant potential for further strengthening state departments of education. That section concerns innovative activities, primarily of a regional nature. The potential inherent in this program could well be the subject of a separate discussion of considerable length.

In closing, lest I appear guilty of overlooking the point, may I say that I am convinced that the years immediately ahead will see further advances made in the already effective communication and cooperation between state departments of education and state education associations, and also between state departments of education and the National Education Association.

A New Look for the State Department of Education—Illinois

Ray Page

WE IN ILLINOIS are happy to share with you some innovations that have taken place in our state as a result of Public Law 89-10 and that have greatly increased state financial assistance to our local schools.

The new financial acts for states provided by the federal government and some new programs established by out state legislature in assisting the local districts have placed great responsibility on the local district in analyzing the complex structure of local school finance in our state. It is important, therefore, that local districts have available to them consultants who can assist them in organizing, developing, and establishing school programs that best meet the local needs and yet fall within the framework of the existing multiplicity of programs available. It is imperative that we in the state office become educational leaders in our state and provide new services that many of us have never provided before in the area of school finance and in the area of additional consultant services needed by the local districts.

My analysis of what has happened in Illinois, may help those of you in other states. First of all, our state legislature passed a Bill of Compensatory Education for youth. However, because of state financial problems, the bill was not funded, and instead Public Law 89-10, Title I, sources were used as a funding act to underwrite cost and program development almost identical to the Compensatory Education Bill. This caused the state office to employ 25 additional professional persons to assist districts in establishing Title I programs, to review Title I programs, and to aid in the auditing and financial aspects of the act. These costs are not minimal when you assume the responsibilities of office space, telephones, secretarial assistance, and the myriad of other needs of state administration that are required to employ 25 new professionals.

In Illinois, guidance was given a tremendous impetus by Title V, NDEA. Since the inception of the NDEA program, our guidance services department has grown from one to 30 full-time professionals. In addition to Title V monies, we have been able to utilize research money from the federal government in establishing new research oriented guidance programs

---

Mr. Page is Superintendent of Public Instruction, Illinois State Department of Education, Springfield, Illinois.

in rural schools and other areas of our state. In addition, we have established a series of elementary guidance centers with a research emphasis on developing sound guidance practices for all children in Illinois. Again, a tremendous change took place in a short time, indicating the need for educational leadership and responsibility at the state level.

Special Education

In a similar fashion, and yet with little federal participation, our department of special education has developed for the last session of the legislature mandatory special education for all children in all school districts by 1968-69. The state legislature has appropriated additional funds. The present appropriation is in excess of $27 million. At the same time, because of the increased emphasis created by the state office and the state legislature, we have been able to utilize some of the existing federal research and developmental money. This has aided us in establishing new demonstration programs and in providing more educational leadership through the employment of state consultants in specialized areas for the handicapped, emotionally disturbed, and related areas.

Four years ago, the state legislature established a program for gifted children. Many of you may already be aware of our experimentation and the demonstration techniques we have used for establishing this program. We have placed a great deal of emphasis on this, and the state legislature has appropriated $8 million for us to continue our efforts. Again, because of the state emphasis, we have been able to utilize some of the federal monies available to provide greater innovation and experimentation in an area that is so important to the schools and has a great implication for the future of our nation.

Curriculum and Instruction Program

Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and Title III, NDEA, have provided the greatest impetus for our curriculum and instruction programs. We have employed several new persons in the state office in special areas of curriculum, audio-visual aids, library resources, and other facets of the Title II program. Because of our increased awareness and increased emphasis we have begun to make significant changes in the instructional programs of our local schools. Curriculum innovations and startling new discoveries of how we can do a better job of educating our youth are beginning to materialize from the federal support and state educational leadership provided to the local districts.

Programs in curriculum development have long been established in our state, but have had difficulty in being financed at a level that would enable us to do a significant job. However, we are now able to bring into the state office, on a consultant or loan basis, some of the very best curriculum people from our universities within the state and to provide real leadership to our schools and to any area program where change is desired.

Supplementary Educational Centers and Services

Illinois has been fortunate in the first round of awards provided by Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We are aware of the many excellent programs that have been submitted, as well as those that will be submitted within the next 6 to 12 months. We are expecting Title III to be a basis for real change in education. This will be the peripheral edge that will provide us with new insights and opportunities in our state. The financing that will be available under Title III will provide the local district with the incentive that can assist the administration and faculty to do the job they have long desired to do and to make the changes that they have desired to make.

Cooperative Research Funds

We are looking very closely at Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because we believe that our State Director of Cooperative Research will work with our various universities in Illinois and with other agencies in a cooperative manner, and that he will be used as a catalytic agent to assist every educational institution in making an effort to utilize the funds under Title IV toward new horizons in education. Increased financial support through the utilization of research funds provided by Title IV, ESEA, can greatly assist our state office, our great universities in Illinois, and the local administrative units in providing new educational programs and new breakthroughs in educational change in our state.

State Department of Education

Title V, ESEA, of course, has done more to provide a change in our state office than any other single aspect of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Last year, on the basis of increased state aid and the implications of Title V, we invited Dr. Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and other state superintendents to be consultants to our office and assist us in analyzing how our state office of education could provide better educational leadership. On the basis of these recommendations and an analysis by members of our state staff, we completed a reorganization in October of this past year, and are currently evaluating where we are, how effective our new organization is, and what possible changes we may see developing in the next one, two, five, or ten years. One important change that we have devised is the establishment of regional educational centers in our state. These six geographic centers, in actuality, will be operating divisions of the office of the superintendent of public instruction and will provide all the services now available in our one state office, in addition to being much closer to the districts and the people that we serve. We believe that the establishment of the regional centers is one of the most important gains that we have had under Public Law 89-10. However, we believe just as important have been some other new positions that we have been able to create in providing a more uniform operation in all areas of educational leadership in the state.

This increased financial assistance from the federal government would not have provided the great change that is now occurring in our state had it not been for a new look and a new approach by our own state legislature in greatly increasing the state foundation program and in providing several new financial acts for our schools. Still, the great responsibility and burden of improving education in Illinois rests with our own state legislature and without its able assistance and cooperation Public Law 89-10 would have done very little to assist the children in our schools. Therefore, it seems to me that it is indeed important to analyze still further the role, the responsibility, and the funding that should be undertaken at the local, state, and national levels in order to give each child in the United States an educational opportunity that will provide him with his cherished ambition and goal of doing the best that he can in his society.

I hope that Congress, the various state legislatures, and other interested parties will soon embark upon a national study of school finance. I would encourage you to support this national study of financial support—its role and responsibility for all existing avenues of government. I believe it is important that we now examine rather closely how we can provide the best tax dollar support for our children. We do not need more complex programs continuing to burden our local administrators, but instead, we need a cooperative effort that will best utilize the tax dollar, regardless of source and regardless of level of government, so that the best education can be afforded each student in the local school.

The Role of the Public School in Organizing, Coordinating, and Financing Community Action Programs

Lewis J. McGuiness

WE HAVE IN THIS SUBJECT several distinctly different topics, each one of which is worthy of separate consideration. I believe, however, that all of these separate and distinct topics can and should be considered logically together in their generalized context, and this I propose to do. However, I propose to exercise a speaker's time-worn privilege, namely, that of slightly altering his topic; I have changed this topic to the broader question of how public school systems should relate generally and specifically to community programs which involve organized and structured social change as goal.

I prefer this somewhat enlarged topic for two reasons. First, community action programs are merely structured methods of organizing and mobilizing all community resources for community action to wipe out poverty. I need not add that they are supposed to have as their goal the elimination of the causes of poverty. Second, community action programs are a structured mechanism of the Office of Economic Opportunity. This federal government mechanism, which dates from 1964, has less than two years of history behind it and as a governmental agency it is subject to rapid alteration, revision, and even, perhaps, political extinction. This being the case and schools having such a long governmental history, I would rather discuss the general area of involving the public school system in structured community social change, which would include local antipoverty structures as we now know them, but would not be limited to the OEO Community Action Programs as they now exist.

If this were a forensic assembly, this question would probably be debated by two teams, one taking the pro side and one attacking the proposition. However, after very careful consideration, I am completely sold on the pro point of view.

Let me state categorically the pro point of view, namely that the school system should have a positive role in planning, staffing, coordinating, and

---

Mr. McGuiness is Acting Chief of Programs Branch, Division of Programs Operations, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

financing community action programs. I believe, further, that this positive supportive relationship should exist for many kinds of community support and change programs, whether their stated aims and objectives are narrowly educational or not. They should be especially supportive of antipoverty or community action programs under the OEO.

Urban Society Today

Before discussing the amount and the extent of the involvement, which this topic suggests, or the amount I am specifically advocating, let me first review some elementary information about the nature of the American urban society as it exists in the last third of the 20th century. Specifically, let us consider the interaction of our multi-troubled society with the American public school.

First, the American public school is the only road to economic independence and success for 85 percent of the American children. For the overwhelming percentage of these children there is no acculturation and educational substitute for the public school system.

Secondly, while the public school system has always had great affinity for the middle class, and indeed, conceives as one of its principal roles the conscious extension of middle-class morals, values, and tastes, yet another special role of the public school has long been the protection of, education of, and advancement of the children of the poor, the children of the disadvantaged.

Those of you who have particular interest in the history of American public education will quickly recall the close identification of early American public-school figures with the plight of the poor. Many of the important names in American public educational theory and social philosophy from Thomas Jefferson and Horace Mann right through to those of the modern day have been concerned and those of today are increasingly concerned with what a colleague of mine likes to call the "peculiar sociological, psychological, and educational problems of the children of the disadvantaged."

Third, American society is beset by enormous social problems: problems of race and racial integration; problems of housing; problems of slum living; problems of rapid population growth; problems of economic survival in a complex technological society; problems of social stratification; problems of crime; and miscellaneous problems incidental to urban living, such a transportation, urban sprawl, and urban ugliness, to mention only a few. Most of these problems are urban problems, but they also exist, to a lesser extent, in almost all of America's rural areas and especially in our small towns.

Last year the *New York Herald Tribune* staff prepared a book which was a compilation of its articles on the problems of the sick urban world that is New York City. The book was aptly titled *New York City in Crisis, A Study in Depth of Urban Sickness.*[1] I mention this book here because just a listing of a few of the chapter headings illustrates this point about our many urban problems:

Chapter	*Title*
1	"Middle Class on the Run"
2	"Harlem Nightmare"
3	"Puerto Rican Poverty Trap"
4	"Youth of the Ghetto"
5	"Nightmare of the Aged"
7	"A One Party City"
9	"The High Cost of Democracy"
12	"Business Exodus"

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune. *New York City in Crisis*. New York: David McKay Co., 1965. 212 p.

17 "Public Funds and Power Politics"
19 "Fear in the Streets"
20 "The Cancer of Narcotics"

One point that I am trying to develop here is that the growing magnitude of social problems and the problems of the schools in dealing with the lower-class children are, I believe, rapidly forcing the large school systems into taking a wide public viewpoint of their social obligations to the child as a whole. This includes the child's parents and older siblings and even the child's neighborhood.

The Whole Child

Many of us in education have long talked about the absolute essentiality of teaching the whole child, of reaching the whole child, of dealing with the whole child. Yet, in reality, we were talking only about the part of the child that was physically present in the school room on any given day. In the intervening years research has told us, not that the child is considerably more influenced by his home, his parents, his family, his peer group, his neighborhood, and his total environment (of which the school is a part, to be sure) than he is by the school, if the school is considered a single factor in the entire social equation.

If we take the concept about teaching the whole child, what do we find? We find that in the swirl of social problems in which the (whole) child finds himself, there are family problems and neighborhood problems which, at least to the child, are more important than any school-related problem or school program. It is significant that Harry Passow in his landmark book, *Education in Depressed Areas,*[2] puts the school fourth in importance to the child by listing it fourth in concern to the child. Passow's concentric circles run from the child as a person, to the family, to the neighborhood, and then to the school.

Fourth, it appears that the schools of the inner city, without important structural changes, will increasingly fail to achieve most of the generally accepted goals of public education. They will increasingly house restless children who fail to achieve and frustrated teachers who will seek only to leave (and probably leave the profession as well).

Positive Relationships to Community Projects

Now, the question we set out to discuss, how can schools best engage in positive relationships to community improvement projects and especially to community action programs?

There are several ways: To start with they can and should help to initiate community action programs and should maintain a seat of influence and power on the community action program board. As indicated earlier, there can be two distinct types of community action program groups, those affiliated and financed by OEO and dependent on the numerous OEO rules and regulations, and various kinds of independent community action and improvement programs. An example of the latter would be a paint-up, clean-up, fix-up campaign in the school neighborhood.

Right now I would like to slay the myth that community involvement programs are fabulously expensive. I admit that some are. I do not think the expense is often justified. I think they can often be run more efficiently.

Schools should cooperate with community action programs, and I mean cooperate actively, both with community action programs now formed, and those still struggling to come into existence.

---

[2] Passow, A. Harry, editor. *Education in Depressed Areas.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963. 359 p.

The statement is often made that bad government is quietly engaged in by millions of silent participators who seek not to become engaged. They often grumble—usually silently—they pay taxes and they vote, but the total of their detached involvement is essentially negative and silent. I cannot say that if they rolled up their sleeves—and this is what I am suggesting that school personnel do—and become activists that government would quickly improve and pressing social problems would immediately diminish in severity. But at least the activists would work off much of their present apathy and their frustrations. The social situation is now so desperate in many of our major cities that even with the help of the schools, great improvements may not be forthcoming, but educators will at least help the situation. Furthermore, I think they will feel better for having been involved.

Now, cooperation is a marvelous concept. It can mean everything or nothing. Every federal agency is loud in its praise of cooperation—its own, of course—with everything and everybody. Yet in truth genuine cooperation seldom has to be loudly affirmed because it springs naturally out of a close association over a protracted period of time. Real cooperation means action, not just words.

Kinds of Cooperation

There can be many ways to give genuine meaning to cooperation. One way would be for the school to use its Title I funds to give structural changes and increased services and benefits to children in community action program target areas. Another way would be to join the community action program in creating genuine community schools in the community action program target areas. Still another way of showing genuine cooperation would be to transfer out of community action program area schools those intransigent administrators who specialize in the form of program wrecking called the silent veto. I have seen this work, and such courtesy is long remembered and appreciated by the community action program people.

Have patience, understand the important differences in the aims of the two different organizations involved (CAP's and schools), and by all means, do not fight the public!

Causes of Conflict

By their very nature community action program groups, if they are to succeed, are designed to push hard and fast for many diverse social changes. In many ways schools tend to look to them like old-fashioned, standpattish organizations that are to be assaulted in the name of social reform. This being the case, a certain amount of conflict is inevitable in the activities of the two different organizations, but again, do not squabble in public. Newspapers, radio, and television are great, but not for public disputes. And remember, organizational disputes are different from family fights—the closer the association, the more minimal will be the dispute, if any.

Since there have been so many public disputes between community action programs and school systems in large cities, in spite of the professional embarrassment of talking about this in public, I feel that I must say something about the actual reasons for these disputes:

First, the community action program is at fault because its leadership has been taken over by irresponsible publicity-happy persons. Where this has happened, the school system will have to defend itself, but it is at least partially responsible for letting the irresponsible leadership into community action program executive positions in the first instance.

A second group of these clashes can best be called public displays of bad temper, inasmuch as they seem to be personality clashes. Where this occurs, and school personnel are responsible, it is regrettable. School administrators should, of course, be more careful than to permit a public display of their personality problems (and the same naturally goes for community action program officials).

A third cause for dispute on program and policies between school executives and community action program executives (and this is a category that most concerns me) is the fundamental difference in public educational philosophy and goals. It is crucial for school-board members (because they always get involved sooner or later in an attempt to resolve the problem) and top school executives to carefully consider their philosophic (and even their political) ground. In some of these disputes which I have examined, both organizations were wrong. In others, I am sorry to state, the schools were wrong because they were refusing to admit to actual socioeconomic realities in regard to the educational problems of the target areas. In effect they were refusing to admit the need for any structural change in slum area schools.

The Schools and Planning

One of the chapters in the *Herald Tribune* book referred to the flight of the middle-class person from the city. The middle-class person has long been gone from most of the community action program target areas. Here is where the schools can serve a vital need of community action programs in helping them get started; by this I mean their initial organizing in the target areas. The school personnel often represent the vast majority of the educated, trained, and publicly oriented personnel that actually know the slum and can help community residents plan community activity programs. What is more, they can do this in most instances without their motives being suspect. These are two strengths that even school people do not recognize they have. For example, social welfare officials who may possibly know the slum best are usually suspected by slum residents as to their true motives; hence they often are unable to operate within the confines of the slum area. Unfortunately, this is also true of slum area businessmen (incidentally, the riots of the past two years have amply demonstrated this point—Watts, Philadelphia, Harlem). Other indigenous professionals in the inner city—ministers, priests, rabbis, lawyers, doctors—often can and do represent the inner city at its organized best, but in every instance school people greatly outnumber this group.

There is another reason, possibly a selfish reason, for schools to get involved early, stay involved, and help plan community action programs. Aims, goals, and programs often represent, in part, important control. While it would be manifestly unfair for the school to attempt in any way to control the community action program organization in a narrow sense, nevertheless, I think it is a part of a school's greater social obligation for it to be concerned that a community action program stay on the difficult path of orderly social improvement and that it get involved in meaningful activities that could have some hope of success. In other words, the kinds of programs that are not just victimizing the poor.

Two criticisms have been leveled at certain community action programs. One is that they sometimes tend to become needlessly involved in social protest for the sake of social protest. In this case I mean almost meaningless negativism versus any positive program to correct or improve something. The other criticism is that they tend to indulge in meaningless piddling programs apparently designed only to give the impression of great activity, but which, when analyzed, are seen to constitute nothing of a substantial nature. Many other criticisms could be made of community action programs, but these particular two can be partially offset by the active cooperation and participation of schools, particularly at the planning stage, hence their relevance to this discussion.

Staff for the Community Action Programs

Help staff the community action programs and help train the nonprofessional workers.

Everything said above in regard to planning could be said here. Just as it takes a complex collection of professionals to staff and run modern school systems, it takes diverse talents to run a successful community action program. We in education have severe personnel shortages, but we can reap substantial institutional rewards through the judicious sharing of some of our scarce professional talent. Just as research and experience have shown that rich personal experiences make people better teachers, supervisors, and administrators, so, too, does experience show that important community involvement can add a significant dimension to educators.

Normally when you help to staff a young and growing organization with professionally oriented persons, you are also helping the new organization to become responsible, and to stay responsible. Responsible management on the part of the community action program is a prime school concern if the school is to have meaningful ties over a period of time.

Many school officials, from classroom teachers and counselors right up to principals, district supervisors, and top executive personnel in the central office, can be prime candidates to help in community action programs. It depends on talents often quite apart from titles and payroll classifications. It often depends on empathy and personality. You may find that the kindergarten teacher has more friends in the community than the principal.

Two Case Histories

In a large northern metropolis a young home-school visitor became a full-time staff person for the JD-CA program during its planning period. He returned to the school system after a few months to head high-school visitors in the target area. Two years later he became an assistant superintendent in the central office with important duties in coordination and cooperation with community agencies.

In a large northern city a young man with one year's experience as a junior high-school counselor, was brought into the JD-CA program as the principal school planner and school liaison person. During the two years he served with the JD-CA program, he was responsible for drawing up and presenting to OEO a significant 1965 summer education program which was funded by OEO. He assisted in running this program in a dual capacity, and now is back full time with the school system as its federal program director with complete authority over their large Title I ESEA program.

Financing Community Action Programs

At the present time there are five sources of funds for community action programs:

1. The Office of Economic Opportunity, Poverty Program Funds (90/10 basis)
2. Local tax dollars
3. Foundations (a declining source of funds)
4. Private donations and grants, etc. (fairly small)
5. The schools (not too much has been done here but still there has been some support).

Since the role of the school in helping to finance community action programs is a central reason for this discussion, let us look at actual ways this could be done.

Title I ESEA—Federal grants are applied through state departments. They are categorical, and their use in specific identifiable programs of community action would be legal as far as federal regulations on PL 89-10 are concerned (obviously this would depend on the exact use). There could be some question in certain states about the legality of conveying actual funds to a community action organization, but it is possible the school would not have to convey actual monies to be able to carry on programs in conjunction with the community action program.

Local tax dollars—Certain community action programs could certainly be supported in part through some school funds which were derived from local tax sources. Because of the severe inadequacy of present tax sources for most schools, however, such funds from this source would have to be minimal.

In lieu support—At the present time all school programs from the OEO/CAP must have 10 percent (at least) local support. For educational programs this is usually accomplished by in lieu support—rent, heat, light, personnel, etc. The school's control over trained personnel is a most valuable asset, and this method of helping community action groups also helps with the problem of coordination and cooperation. School buildings can be used as office space for the community action programs, and as regional headquarters for community action projects. The school buildings along with rather run-down churches are often the only places in the central core areas where public meetings can be held; hence the use of the school is natural. If the school can permit community action groups to meet in the school and can also absorb the rental cost, this can be another important in lieu contribution to the CAP. Schools can get surplus office furniture from the federal, state, and local governments faster than almost anyone else, and they should not be afraid to lend this office equipment to community action organizations. Another way of helping could be the occasional free rental of audio-visual equipment (through school personnel) to keep budgets down and their good will up.

At the present time there are between 400 and 500 Community Action Programs in operation or being started. Because many of them are regional or county-wide, they cross school district lines and one community action group may deal with several school systems. I estimate that about 1,500 school systems are affected by community action groups in their areas, many of them among the largest in America.

Most of these 1,500 school systems have no difficulty in spending their present Title I ESEA money. Hence, there cannot be any sizeable community action funding through this source, unless and until funds from Title I ESEA are increased by the Congress, an increase, incidentally, not contemplated in the 1967 federal Budget. Frankly, Title I ESEA appears to me to be the best source of those indicated (if we eliminate in lieu support) for school support of community action programs.

Coordination

For all practical purposes, coordination is similar to cooperation. However, it seems to imply greater participation and even membership in a distinct group for purposes of carrying on a predetermined program. It has long been the dream of urban sociologists, and even some educational sociologists, that there could one day be a genuine coordinated attack on health problems, educational problems, and welfare problems. Others would add housing and employment to this list. Some thinkers believe that the schools are best equipped to head any such coordinated attack in these areas because the school is the only agency that, practically speaking, touches every child and most homes.

My own opinion is that this makes for interesting discussion, but that we are a long way from forming new coordinated organizations for this purpose. Nevertheless, schools do desperately need to coordinate more of their activities with health and welfare groups. An excellent example here is the Head Start programs. Without the coordinated support of public school systems, high-school programs could not get off the ground in most communities.

Let us talk about manpower needs, improved vocational educational offerings, improved business educational offerings, MDTA programs in conjunction with community action programs. Let us consider adult education programs, parent education programs, dropout programs for older unemployed siblings. All these programs could and should be coordinated through a community action program.

I can think of some other ways to coordinate some of our curricular activities in biology, health, nutrition, and civics with health and welfare programs aimed to clear up venereal disease and to halt drug addiction. Perhaps similar coordinated campaigns could bear fruit in recreation, housing, and traffic safety.

I am sure that the schools would get as much as they gave in any such coordinated programs. For one thing, it would help the school add a dimension of reality to its curriculum in a way that nothing else could. It would also teach young people practical citizenship in a way that textbooks cannot.

Schools do not have a choice on whether or not to become involved in helping to solve community problems. The choice now left to us is *how* to become involved, and what role we are to play in the cluster of organizations and groups running these community action activities.

The schools will get back tangible benefit to themselves for everything they give. Two intangibles they will get back are increased community respect and increased community support. I for one feel we can scarcely have too much of either commodity.

Role of the Federal Government in School Finance Research

William P. McLure

THE FEDERAL government provides funds for support of research in school finance through the Cooperative Research Act of 1957 and the amendment of 1965. This government, then, has an established role in supporting research in this field.

I have considered the subject by asking myself such questions as the following: What is the status of research in school finance? Is basic knowledge being advanced fast enough to nourish the applied phases? Is research lagging in the application of available basic knowledge to help solve pressing problems? Who is doing research in school finance? What are the institutional arrangements and commitments to research in this field? What are the sources of financial support for research in school finance? Is there too little research, or too much? Is the field being researched systematically? Or is the pattern spotty, provincial, and fragmented? Does research lack impact? If so, is it due to poor quality, lack of magnitude, failure of having results disseminated, unrelated to decision-making processes, and other reasons? Obviously, I cannot answer these questions but they provide a basis for considering the role of the federal government in this field.

I inquired about the extent of federal support of research in school finance through the Cooperative Research Act and received the following information: As of February 15, 1966, eleven projects have been supported by the U.S. Office of Education through the Cooperative Research Act. The projects were distributed as follows:

1. State and local support plans	6	$360,790
2. Problems of public understanding, determinants of expenditures, and controls at local levels	3	362,224
3. Nationwide costs and benefits	1	152,137
4. Fiscal support of federal activities and local government	1	3,804

Only two ongoing projects are reported as of this date for a total outlay of $219,126.

I have not identified a source of even a rough estimate of support from other sources during the period for which federal grants have been reported. A proper accounting of such support would include prorating the salaries of professors, members of state

---

Dr. McLure is Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

departments of education, and other researchers as well as direct expenses. Therefore, I do not have facts to put the federal contribution into any context. In all probability the federal funds have been a small proportion of the total funds spent in this field.

These federal funds symbolize a marked change in the role of the federal government in supporting research in school finance. The specific nature of that role will be of special interest to researchers.

What are researchers in school finance thinking about this change, or potential change, in the role of the federal government? To get some indication of thought in the field, I wrote to 50 colleagues and asked them to respond to eight questions. I received 36 replies.

The first question was this: *What should be the relative dependence of school finance research of different agencies on various sources of funds?*

The responses to this question are shown in Table 1. The respondents were asked to indicate their preference of *none, some,* and *much* support from each of the three sources for each agency which is listed. The weightings of these responses may be summarized as follows:

1. The predominant preference for support of research in the U.S. Office of Education is the federal government.
2. State and local governments are the preferred sources for state departments of education, followed by the federal government. Some persons think that nonrevenue sources may be important.
3. Preferences for local and intermediate districts are diffused, with state and local governments receiving a slight lead.
4. Colleges and universities have a slight lead for state and local sources. This could be due to the bias of the respondents who are predominantly college professors in state universities.
5. There is a division of opinion about support for this research in interstate compacts (special regional centers).
6. The opinion about professional associations is weighted heavily in favor of nonrevenue sources, mainly those of institutional support. There is considerable interest, however, in provision of some support to these agencies from government.

The second question was: *What type of grant is preferable from the viewpoint of the research agency receiving the grant?*

TABLE 1.—INDEXES OF PREFERRED* SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH ON SCHOOL FINANCE BY VARIOUS AGENCIES, 1966

Agency	Source of support Federal government	 State and local government	 Nonrevenue sources
1	2	3	4
U.S. Office of Education	45	3	9
State departments of education	37	52	16
Local and intermediate school districts	33	37	27
Colleges and universities	48	54	43
Interstate compacts	25	29	33
National professional associations	20	9	40
State and local professional associations	16	19	52
Other nonprofit organizations	13	9	39

* Preferences of 30 researchers in school finance were scored as follows: none=0; some=1; much=2.

A. *Grants for long-term* program; *with careful specification of areas and types of research, periodic reporting and review?*

B. *Grants for specific* projects, *with proposals submitted individually for each project?*

This question was designed to explore the possibility of an issue over methods of support on a *project* basis as contrasted with a *program* basis. The responses are shown in Table 2. The programmatic type has a lead in preference to the project type for the U.S. Office of Education, state departments of education, colleges and universities, and interstate compacts. It may be significant that the combination of preferences for "program" and "project" support outweighs the "no preference" responses for all of the agencies.

TABLE 2.—INDEXES OF PREFERRED* TYPES OF GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON SCHOOL FINANCE BY VARIOUS AGENCIES, 1966

Agency receiving grant	Type of grant		
	Program	Project	No preference
1	2	3	4
U.S. Office of Education	32	13	12
State departments of education	54	21	30
Local and intermediate districts	24	50	23
Colleges and universities	60	41	44
Interstate compacts	43	16	28
National professional associations	15	24	30
State and local professional associations	20	45	22
Other nonprofit organizations	6	29	26

* Preferences of 30 researchers in school finance were scored as follows: none=0; some=1; much=2.

A distribution of responses by source and type of support is shown in Table 3. Here some further distinctions in preferences show up. The leading preference of support from the federal government is for *program* grants to the U.S. Office of Education, state departments of education, and colleges and universities. I suspect that these responses indicate considerable dissatisfaction with the project type of support of research from the federal government.

There is preference for support on a program basis for funds from state and local governments to state departments of education and interstate compacts. The opinion is divided with reference to colleges and universities and local and intermediate districts. There is considerable preference for programmatic type of support from nonrevenue sources for colleges and universities and interstate compacts.

The third question was: *During the past five years approximately what proportion of funds supporting school finance research has been received by your institution from each of the following: (1) federal government, (2) state government, (3) local government, (4) nonrevenue: foundation grants, gifts, misc.?*

I did not have enough respondents for all agencies to obtain a picture of the distribution of support for this research by agency. Replies from 18 professors showed an average as follows for universities: federal, 22 percent; state, 38 percent; local, 22 percent; nonrevenue, 18 percent. These figures comprise only budgeted research funds, not the total cost including prorated

TABLE 3.—INDEXES OF PREFERRED* SOURCES OF SUPPORT AND TYPES OF GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON SCHOOL FINANCE BY VARIOUS AGENCIES, 1966

Agency	Federal government			State and local government			Nonrevenue sources		
	Program	Project	No preference	Program	Project	No preference	Program	Project	No preference
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
U.S. Office of Education	32	4	9	0	2	1	0	7	2
State departments of education	19	10	8	31	4	17	4	7	5
Local and intermediate school districts	7	20	6	14	13	10	3	17	7
Colleges and universities	27	11	10	21	20	13	12	10	21
Interstate compacts	8	7	10	13	4	12	22	5	6
National professional associations	4	6	10	1	4	4	10	14	16
State and local professional associations	2	10	4	4	11	4	14	24	14
Other nonprofit organizations	1	7	5	1	4	4	4	18	17

* Preferences of 30 researchers in school finance were scored as follows: none= 0; some=1; much=2.

salaries of permanent staff and other hidden expenses.

The fourth question was: *Which of the sources listed in Question 3 does your agency or institution depend upon mostly for payment of "permanent" (as opposed to part-time assistants and "temporary") staff for time spent in school finance research?*

With only one exception, respondents indicated that their institutions depended upon basic institutional sources of support for payment of salaries of permanent staff for their time spent in research.

The fifth question was: *Have you any preferences for the sources of funds to support school finance research as you would like to see it developed in your agency or institution?*

The answers to this question are interesting. Respondents were divided on their preferences of sources for development of school finance research in their institutions. Some preferred the federal government but disliked the uncertainty of support over the long term and the nature of project support. Others preferred their main sources of institutional support because of greater assurance that freedom of inquiry would be maintained, that there was greater stability for long-term planning, and that there was less likelihood of slanting research through selective emphasis in the granting of funds.

The sixth question was: *In what ways, if any, do you think school finance research might be improved by careful delineation of purpose among agencies or institutions listed in Questions 1 and 2? (See Table 1 for list of agencies.)*

There seemed to be a lack of clarity on the delineation of research among agencies. Some persons advocated guidelines which describe purposes of agencies. Some wanted a clearing house to keep track of research and to classify it. Some mentioned "staking out" areas for particular agencies to concentrate on. Some even wanted some coordination. Others said to forget the idea and get on with some research.

I believe there is a genuine concern which suggests the need for better communication about research in the field. Like other fields of activity, research is competitive. Individuals and institutions ultimately make choices which shape the nature of their programs. Part of one's task in doing research is to delineate (describe) the field in which he formulates alternatives of choice.

The seventh question was: *Have you any comments about improvement of research in school finance that may not be covered appropriately under the preceding questions?*

This question evoked an assortment of suggestions as follows:

1. Broaden the field to include public finance.
2. Seek better comparability of data.
3. Have more research conducted by teachers and administrators.
4. Hold nationwide conference on purposes and activities of various agencies.
5. Continue theoretical and applied research.
6. Conduct more research on the economics of education.
7. Conduct more research on a continuing basis. (Much does not fit the current project-type support of granting agencies.)
8. Conduct more interdisciplinary research.
9. Conduct small-scale experimentation to test some of the theories in finance.
10. Conduct more large-scale, long-range projects which cannot be done by professors who teach full-time and try to do research on an overload basis.

Summary

The responses to these questions suggest that the subject of this paper is worthy of serious study. They have reinforced my thinking sufficiently for me to venture some hypotheses or tentative conclusions for consideration. They are as follows:

1. Educational institutions of all kinds should re-examine their committments to research in school finance.

Most universities, for example, operate under the early concept of a full-time teacher who does his research out of his brief case (which he always carries) on weekends. Perhaps fewer than 10 universities have a tacit understanding that even one professor will teach one or two graduate courses and devote the remainder of his time to research in finance. The research of universities and other agencies within states tends to be provincial and action-oriented within the respective state. This is not necessarily or even altogether bad. Most of the major theories, as a matter of fact, came out of state studies; e.g., the Strayer-Haig equalization concept; Mort's Key district idea, tax broadening and other concepts; and principles which other persons helped to establish.

Universities generally do not organize for research as they do for teaching courses in school administration. That is, they do not commit staff time and basic resources from institutional funds to ensure a continuous and substantial program of research in this field. On the contrary, they have responded to the increased availability of project-type grants of outside agencies in recent years without an adequate and corresponding increase of institutional support. The result is that some institutions are becoming increasingly dependent on granting agencies;

this leading to greater instability for career commitments of individuals to major research activity in the field.

With few exceptions state departments had done little more than establish beachheads for rudimentary levels of research until the federal government entered the field through the Education Act of 1965. It is, perhaps, too early to speculate on the future course of developments in school finance research in these agencies. The issue may be whether the state legislatures will respond to the federal stimulation in such a way as to establish basic support for this research from state revenue to be supplemented by federal funds; or whether developments will be the other way around.

This same issue will apply to local and regional (intermediate) units. In this case there may be another issue as to whether the majority of these districts will go beyond the support necessary to meet the requirements in getting federal funds. If this happens, something analogous to the minimum foundation program concept may develop, namely, the minimum may become the effective maximum in too many instances.

As for professional associations, I find it difficult to distinguish any difference between their research and some research in state departments and universities. They are in strategic positions to make unique contributions. I think their potential relationships with other educational agencies are tremendous and should be developed.

2. School finance needs nationwide evaluation which will include participation from other disciplines such as economics and political science. I think, however, that education should maintain leadership and that the policies of grantors, including the federal government, should not be designed so that either the direct or the indirect effect of support would weaken professional education as a discipline of intellectual activity.

3. School finance needs all types of research, not panaceas. It needs empirical, nonempirical, programmatic, project, small-scale, large-scale, basic, action, and any other type of systematic inquiry possible.

4. I see the following choices of roles of the federal government: (a) avoidance; (b) general supplementary support consisting of grants to support long-term programs, somewhat analogous to general aids on a measure-of-need basis; (c) categorical support consisting of aid for specific projects; and (d) support for research centers which might be organized as autonomous units or as inter-institutional compacts of some type.

The present role appears to be the third one. I am not convinced that this is the most effective role, or that it is fully developed. In my opinion a combination of program and project-type aids to institutions would be best. In addition, a supplementary program of support for research centers may be desirable, particularly for research on large problems which might require contributions of talent from several institutions.

In any event, I would insist on certain principles. Three basic ones are freedom of the researcher (a) to formulate the subject of study, (b) to choose the methods of study, and (c) to publish the results of study. The scope of subjects eligible for support and the criteria for approving grants should be broad. Otherwise there will be the ever-present risk that the ostensible demands of external scrutiny to ensure productivity will tend to squelch rather than enhance the creative atmosphere that is essential for much research.

I believe that the federal government should exercise an effective role in the support of research, including school finance. I do not believe that this role is necessarily inconsistent with a set of principles that would foster creative and productive research.

Research Needs in School Finance

BEFORE THE National Conference on School Finance the Committee asked 12 experienced research workers in school finance to identify major areas of research needs. The responses were as follows:

W. Monfort Barr, School Finance Consultant, Division of Administration, Field Service, and Educational Placement, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana—

Considerable research should be done to determine the actual extra cost of educating the "culturally deprived" or "disadvantaged" student whether he is in New York City, the Watts area of Los Angeles, or Appalachia.

I also suggest research on the actual effect on interest rates of substitution of state for local credit, state guarantees of local debt, and related procedures.

Charles S. Benson, Associate Professor, University of California, Berkeley, California—

I suggest the following research needs:

1. The investigation of production functions in education. Essentially this is a matter of relating closely defined educational objectives to a set of educational inputs. I would stress the "period of production" for the acquisition of various skills in reading, arithmetic, and the like, for I believe it is very important to know more about the amounts of pupil time required to reach certain learning outcomes under various combinations of educational resources.

2. The relation between the "consumption" of various types of school services by different sorts of households and the "consumption" of other public services by these same households. Presumably, public services are characterized by many instances of complementary and competitive relationships. As a first step in trying to understand these relationships it would be well to know what the rates of participation in special school programs vis-a-vis participation in other household-oriented public services are.

Jesse Burkhead, Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York—

My suggestions for research needs in educational finance are very much a product of work that we have been doing here recently on large-city education. These suggestions are certainly not intended to be comprehensive of the field.

1. Program budgeting
   a. The financing of elementary and secondary education in large cites will very likely be of increasing, not diminishing, importance in the immediate years ahead. Special programs

of federal and state aid for culturally deprived areas will continue to expand. There is no immediate prospect that the massive increases in per-pupil expenditures that are needed in the older central cities will, in fact, be forthcoming. Therefore, increased attention must be directed toward a more effective use of resources within education, and particularly in large cities.

b. The time has come for concerted efforts to undertake the necessary research which must underpin a new approach to school budgeting. The federal government is now introducing a planning-programming-budgeting system in all departments and agencies. State and local governments are taking an increased interest in this approach. School administrators and students of educational finance should also join in this effort.

c. The major task is to devise a budget format that will lend itself to the measurement of educational outcomes and relate these outcomes to costs. This is a difficult matter, but even modest progress in this direction will permit a more effective appraisal of the relationship of educational gains to additional resources than is now possible.

2. Fiscal imbalance in the metropolitan area

a. The governmental needs, including educational needs, of large cities continue to outstrip available tax resources. The municipal finance crisis continues to be far more serious in the central city than in the suburban communities.

b. Students of educational finance should continue to explore that hardy perennial of their field—the need to expand the tax resource base, the local level. Both organizational and financial matters affecting elementary and secondary schools must inevitably be subject to increasing attention at the level of metropolitan-wide solutions.

Herold C. Hunt, Eliot Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts—

Paramount, in my opinion, is the need of research activity relating the cost factor to quality education.

H. Thomas James, Professor, School of Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California—

The top priority I would assign to research in school finance would go to the problem I discussed a year ago in the paper that was published as a part of the proceedings of that session; that is, the problems of developing a new system of accounting for educational costs.

I propose two lines of experimentation to increase the usefulness of school accounting in budget making, and to increase the flow of information to the critical levels of policy making.

First, school accounting is generally viewed as a system for making historical records of financial transactions, reporting legal and prudential stewardship of public money, and summarizing periodically the financial position of the district. The line items grew from simple operations and have remained fixed for half a century despite sponsible administrators at the lower growing complexity in school district operations. Whatever utility the line items had initially for reporting and for periodic summaries of the cash position of the district, they are not now useful for any systematic analysis of school expenditures in terms of input-output models. The first line of experimentation I suggest is, therefore, toward devising a system of accounts that will break down the complex operation of modern school districts into rational subsystems within the total system. Such a breakdown should permit analysis of relatively complete subsystems on a comparative basis. We already systematize our accounting for transportation and food costs, and are beginning to do so in systems for financing education of handicapped children. These beginnings can be extended, and other subsystems identified.

What I am urging is extensive experimentation to determine what subsystems are most useful for analysis, whether it be by attendance centers, or by areas of instruction, perhaps even by subject matter and by grade level, and to see whether each of the systems of services auxiliary to instruction can be analyzed. Modern accounting technology makes any of these approaches feasible; in fact, the equipment available in many school systems puts us in reach of another kind of analysis that may eventually make a breakthrough in the study of school costs, through analysis of exposure of the individual child to school services on a basis not unlike the job-order approach to allocation of hospital costs, or car repair costs in a garage.

Second, given the necessary accounting by subsystems, it should be possible to raise more information to the policy level for making efficient decisions on budgets by requesting responsible administrators at the lower levels to estimate the consequences of alternative allocations to each subsystem on performance. Thus, the administrator of a given subsystem could be asked to prepare, and justify in terms of performance criteria and value judgments set by the top policy-making level of the system, three separate budgets, one based on the previous year's allocation of funds to that subsystem, a second contemplating, for instance, a 20-percent increase in the funds, and a third contemplating a 20-percent reduction in the allocations.

R. L. Johns, Head of the Department, Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida—

I am listing two areas of research which are highly important:

1. Local decision-making on school fiscal policy. This area of research will involve:
   a. The relationship of local decisions on school finance to local financial effort, ability, and innovation in the educational program.
   b. The analysis of the process of local decision-making. This will involve the application of general systems theory to school decision-making. It will involve the study of how decisions are made in the formal school organization and in the informal community power structure.
   c. The development of strategies for obtaining improved local school financing. The development of these strategies will involve the application of systems theory.
2. The development of appropriate incentive plans to incorporate in the state foundation program. Convincing evidence has been produced which indicates that there is a need to incorporate in the state foundation program

some way of assuring that local school districts will make a reasonably adequate financial effort to support the schools. A number of techniques are being used and they should be evaluated. Criteria should be developed for appraising and developing incentive plans.

Erick L. Lindman, Professor of Education, Department of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California—

The most important research need is more of a development project than a research project, but I regard it as extremely important: Redesign state school support systems and the account classifications used in public-school budgeting so as to identify significant "programs" and their revenue sources. By so doing, it should be possible to allocate the cost of each such program more appropriately among the three principal sources of revenue—the federal government, the state, and local property taxpayers. The revised system should provide information needed by the U. S. Congress, by state legislatures, and by local school boards to relate the benefits to the costs of each program.

Eugene P. McLoone, Senior Staff Scientist, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.—

The basic questions upon which research is needed are (a) the priorities to be given to research in school finance; (b) the necessary prerequisites for doing such research, including data availability and model building; and (c) the necessary consequents of research in school finance toward additional questions to be researched.

There is a great need for ongoing research related to use of resources and their payoff, program research to assemble what is being done and to provide a means of monitoring, and project research where serious gaps develop or new techniques are required.

The limits of our knowledge of the status of tools used in financing and the intricate relationships of federal and state grants with local taxes indicate areas requiring special attention. The value-added concept seems an appropriate means to achieve the desired results at many levels. The need for a comprehensive model or theory puts this area in the forefront of requirements. There is a need to examine priorities and to discover what should be done first, even though I do not believe in establishing priorities for the research of others.

The appropriate means for establishing priorities is the meeting of research interest on the part of a practitioner with one willing to finance a project or a program. For ongoing research, the appropriate priority seems to be the needs of the organization or program. Groups financing research need to examine the directions they wish to pursue in school finance research. Universities, for example, may prefer to finance a program of persons committed to the field because such an emphasis is good for graduate education. Others may wish to develop theory. Still others may be interested in short-term or long-range public policies.

Persons doing research also make choices among the available opportunities as to what they will do. The changing nature of the content of school finance, the over-all conceptual framework, and other aspects seem to indicate that all involved in school finance research would give a structuring of the field first priority. A new study of problems and issues in school finance with attention to content, methods, and articles on why we cannot do what we should, would be helpful to both practitioners of research and financiers. A single man at a single institution [Mort at Columbia] provided such a basis in the past; today a structure is needed beyond that provided by the Annual Conference of the Committee on Educational Finance, which is the only structuring of a field of interest to many with varied needs, viewpoints, goals, and backgrounds.

Such attempts as can be made at restructuring the field so that diversity among researchers yields conclusions pointing to phenomena differences and moves away from different results because of semantic or nominal differences would enhance our knowledge and is where school finance should proceed. There is agreement on needs but not on method or final outcomes. Especially great is the need for the parts now researched to approximate a whole even though the parts are diverse. Much work needs doing, but there are few persons or groups to do it.

William McLure, Director, Bureau of Educational Research, College of Education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois—

My first suggestion concerns *the nature of fiscal controls in education.* A few sub-questions will indicate part of the problem as I see it: (a) Is local control on its way out? (b) Who is to decide on the "mix" or allocation of fiscal resources available to the local district? (c) Do we have enough knowledge about the inherent educational factors of need which determine the most efficient distribution of resources? (d) To what extent shall the distribution of fiscal resources be based on inherent educational needs which are subject to logical and scientific verification, or to what extent shall the distribution be based on the value structures of pressure groups and decision makers?

The second area of research is *the concept of adequacy of financial support.* This is closely related to the first one and might even be treated as a part of it, but the questions under this subject are as follows: (a) What are the criteria for justifying expansion in breadth to handle new problems or to accommodate the general process of change? (b) What are the criteria for improving the dimension of depth while meeting the dimension of breadth? (c) Are there fundamental shifts in the roles of governmental agencies with authority to set the criteria of adequacy? If so, what are the implications of such shifts?

Edgar L. Morphet, Professor of Education, Emeritus, University of California, Berkeley, California—

My suggestions for major research needs are as follows:

Measurement of educational need—Many advances have been made since the pioneering studies in the area by Mort and others beginning in the early 1920's. During the past few years some important new concepts have emerged on the basis of insights into problems and requirements for the education of economically and culturally deprived children. New studies in this area are needed.

The financing of vocational-technical education in states—This area has never been adequately studied. Some of the patterns established under the Smith-Hughes Act are apparently being followed in some states. What inequities are found in present state methods of allotting funds and why? What are valid measures of need that states can use?

Impact of new federal funds and programs — Substantial federal funds are now available for special aspects of the educational program. Most of these funds allotted to school districts cannot be considered as locally available revenues in relationship to state support programs. At least two kinds of problems should be studied: (a) what adjustments, if any, are needed in state support formulas and programs to assure equity and (b) what impacts are these federal special-purpose funds and state special-purpose funds having on decision-making and program planning in local school systems?

J. Alan Thomas, Assistant Professor, Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois—

I suggest that the following are areas in which additional research needs to be done: (a) economic and noneconomic factors affecting the supply and demand for teachers; (b) factors affecting household demand for educational services; and (c) relationship between school (or school district) size, diversity of the school's activity "mix," and patterns of cost.

Austin D. Swanson, Associate Professor of Education, School of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo, New York—

Below are five research needs in educational finance:

Application of operations research techniques to allocation problems—Advances made in the measurement of output through such projects as Project Talent and the Quality Measurement Project have made it practical to apply operations research techniques to educational allocation problems. Techniques which should be particularly applicable are systems analysis, linear and nonlinear programming, and classical optimization theory.

Impact of urbanization of governmental expenditures—It has been well documented that governmental costs are higher in large urban areas, particularly in the central cities. How much of these costs reflects a shift from providing services in the private sector to providing them in the public sector? How much of these costs reflects services to the region? What is the fiscal impact on the concentration of governmental, charitable, and nonprofit institutions in urban centers? How can metropolitan areas be organized to more equitably spread the cost of governmental services within the metropolis?

Cost analysis of educational programs—A lot of money is being distributed to school districts under the assumption that an adequate educational program for certain groups, especially the culturally deprived, is more expensive than for other groups, typically the middle-class white youngster. Is this a valid assumption? If it is, just how much more expensive are these programs?

The effect of salary level and salary schedule structure upon professional staffing—State-mandated salary schedules are forcing many (probably most) school districts into inefficient use of their salary allocations. How can salary schedules be made more complementary to the personnel requirements of the district and the sociological and cultural organization of the community?

The federal role in school finance—There appears to be general dissatisfaction with the present means of distributing federal monies to public schools. The proposals which have been put forward have mostly been based on theories governing state distribution of monies. Distribution of money at the federal level cannot be treated in the same manner as distribution of money at the state level. Other factors enter in, principally variations in the labor market costs.

Roster of Participants

ALBERGOTTI, WILLIAM M., Coordinator of Fiscal Affairs, The School District of Greenville County, 420 North Pleasantburg Drive, Greenville, South Carolina 29606.

ALKIN, MARVIN, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

ALLEN, DAVID, Assistant Superintendent of Business, 738 10th Street, Wilmette, Illinois. 60091.

BARNES, JARVIS, Assistant Superintendent for Research and Development, Atlanta Public Schools, Administration Building, 224 Central Avenue, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30303.

BARNETT, MAURICE C., Administrator, Research and Planning, Utah State Board of Education, 223 State Capitol Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84114.

BARR, W. MONFORT, Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

BARRY, ROYAL P., Director, Budgetary Services, Denver Public Schools, 414 Fourteenth Street, Denver, Colorado 80202.

BEATTIE, ALFRED W., County Superintendent, Allegheny County Schools, 345 County Office Building, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219.

BECHDOLT, BURLEY V., Director of Research, Indiana State Teachers Association, 150 W. Market Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

BELZ, PAUL H., Director of Research, Nebraska State Education Association, 605 S. 14th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68508.

BERTOLAET, FREDERICK, Executive Secretary, The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, 5400 North St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60625.

BILLS, HAROLD Y., Director of Business Services, State Department of Education, 225 W. State Street, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

BLACKBURN, CLIFFORD S., Professor of School Administration, North Texas State University, P. O. Box 6265, North Texas Station, Denton, Texas 76203.

BLOUNT, JOHN G., JR., Administrative Assistant and Director, Division of Finance, State Board of Education, State Office Building, Richmond, Virginia 23216.

BOWER, JOHN D., Kansas Legislature, R. R. #1, McLouth, Kansas 66054.

BRIGHTON, STAYNER F., Research Director, Washington Education Association, 910 5th Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104.

BRYAN, WILLIAM B., Research Director, Alabama Education Association, 422 Dexter Avenue, P. O. Box 4177, Montgomery, Alabama 36104.

BURRUP, PERCY, Visiting Professor, University of Illinois, 288H Education Building, Urbana, Illinois 61822.

BUTLER, HENRY E., JR., Associate Professor, College of Education, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York 14627.

BUTLER, JAMES T., Executive Secretary, Nevada State Education Association, 151 Park Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701.

CAMERON, EVERETT, Comptroller, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

CAMERON, JOHN L., Chief, Administrative-Instructional Support Branch, Division of State Agency Cooperation, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202.

CAPUANO, ANTHONY, Assistant Director, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201.

CARRIGAN, RICHARD M., Assistant Secretary, Teacher Education and Professional Standards, NEA, Washington, D. C. 20036.

CARSON, WARREN, School Finance Director, State Department of Education, 324 Public Service Building, Salem, Oregon 97310.

CHAMBERS, M. M., Chairman of the Survey Team, State National Bank Building, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

CHANDLER, RUTH R. (Mrs.), Box 416, Aberdeen, Idaho.

CHANG, NAI-KWANG, Coordinator, Statistical Analyses, Colorado State Department of Education, State Office Building, Denver, Colorado 80203.

COREY, ARTHUR F., State Executive Secretary, California Teachers Association, 1705 Murchison Drive, Burlingame, California 94011.

COZZENS, L. C., Vice-Chairman, Legislative and Finance Commission, New Mexico Education Association, Box 729, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

CROSSON, FRED J., Director of Research, Tennessee Education Association, 598 James Robertson Parkway, Nashville, Tennessee 37219.

CROWLEY, ELMER S., Administrative Director, National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers Associations, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

DALY, RONALD, Salary Consultant, Professional Development and Welfare, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

DAVIS, HAZEL, Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

DEGOOD, KENNETH C., Associate Dean, College of Education, The University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio 43606.

DeWEES, CLARENCE, Assistant Superintendent and Director of Finance, State Capitol, State Capitol Station, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105.

DIMICK, DONALD E., Supervisor, School Finance, State Department of Public Instruction, State Capitol, Madison, Wisconsin 53702.

DOMIAN, O. E., Professor of Education, University of Minnesota, 205 Burton Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

ECKERT, A. W., Assistant Superintendent, Business Affairs, Minneapolis Public Schools, 807 N.E. Broadway, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413.

EISENBERG, HARRY O., Supervising Principal, DeLaWarr School District, Chase Avenue, Garfield Park, New Castle, Delaware 19720.

ELDER, DAVID E., Research Director, Illinois Education Association, 100 E. Edwards Street, Springfield, Illinois 62704.

FARNER, FRANK, Acting Director of Higher Education, 10 Whitney Road, Storrs, Connecticut 06268.

FEIRER, JOHN L., Editor, Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, West Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001.

FILLION, PAUL R., Chief, Administration, State Department of Education, Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

FIRMAN, WILLIAM D., Director, Division of Evaluation, University of the State of New York, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201.

FLANIGAN, JEAN M., Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036, and Staff Contact of Committee on Educational Finance.

FLESHER, WILLIAM R., President, Cooperative Educational Enterprises, Inc., 1286 West Lane Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43221.

FORSYTHE, JOHN S., General Counsel, Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 4230 New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

FORSYTHE, RALPH A., Associate Professor of School Administration, University of Denver, Denver, Colorado 80210.

FRAILEY, CHARLES, Director of Research, Wisconsin Education Association, 404 Insurance Building, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.

FREEMAN, JAMES W., 2745 Lindale Avenue, N.E., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52402.

FREY, GEORGE J., Assistant Secretary for Communications, Kansas State Teachers Association, 715 West Tenth Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

FULLER, JOHN B., 4525 South Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60653.

FUNDERBURK, EARL C., Division Superintendent, Fairfax County School Board, 10700 Page Avenue, Fairfax, Virginia 22030.

GALYEAN, E. L., Director of Research, Texas State Teachers Association, 316 W. 12th Street, Austin, Texas 78701.

GARVUE, ROBERT J., Assistant Professor of Education, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

GAUERKE, WARREN E., Professor of Educational Administration, College of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan 48202.

GOLDBERG, IRVING, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, 138 South Broadway, Yonkers, New York 10701.

GOTT, JOHN, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, 7301 Kathleen Avenue, N.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

GRIEDER, CALVIN, Professor of School Administration, School of Education, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

HACK, WALTER G., Associate Professor, The Ohio State University, Center for Educational Administration, 65 S. Oval Drive, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

HAKANSON, JOHN, Director of Research, Oregon Education Association, 1530 S.W. Taylor Street, Portland, Oregon 97205.

HANCOCK, EVERETT D., Assistant Superintendent, Jefferson County Board of Education, 3332 Newburg Road, Louisville, Kentucky 40218.

HANSON, NELS W., Supervisor of Finance Planning and Budget Control, State Department of Public Instruction, Olympia, Washington 98501.

HARMAN, ALLEN C., Superintendent, Montgomery County Schools, Court House, Norristown, Pennsylvania 19404.

HATHAWAY, CHARLES E., Division of School Finance, State Department of Education, 425 State Office Building, Sherman at Colfax, Denver, Colorado 80203.

HEATHMAN, HOMER W., JR., Chairman, Legislative and Finance Commission, New Mexico Education Association, Box 729, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

HEBERT, WILLIAM H., Vice-Chairman, NEA Legislative Commission, Massachusetts Teachers Association, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

HECKER, STANLEY, Professor, 417 Erickson Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48823.

HEDLUND, PAUL A., Assistant to the President, Minnehaha Academy, Mississippi River Road at 31st Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55406.

HILGENDORF, EDWIN R., Assistant Superintendent for Business Management, Dade County Public Schools, Lindsey Hopkins Building, 1410 N.E. 2nd Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.

HILL, DONALD W., Assistant Superintendent, Board of Education, 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

HINDMAN, JOHN P., Classroom Teacher, 1128 Walnut Drive, Casa Grande, Arizona 85222.

HOGAN, LLOYD, Chief, Bureau of Educational Finance Research, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201.

HORNBOSTEL, VICTOR O., Associate Professor of Education, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075.

HUDSON, C. CALE, Bureau of Surveys, School of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana 47405.

HUTCHINS, CLAYTON D., Specialist in Educational Finance, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

HUTCHINSON, P. E., Director, Division of School Finance, Texas Education Agency, Capitol Station, 201 East 11th Street, Austin, Texas 78711.

IVERSON, IRVING L., Executive Secretary, North Dakota Education Association, 410 E. Thayer Avenue, Bismarck, North Dakota 58502.

JOHNS, O. D., Professor of Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma 73069.

JOHNS, R. L., Professor of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32601.

JOHNSON, RAY H., Assistant Chief, Division of Public School Administration, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California 95814.

JOLLY, W. C., Division of Finance, Kentucky Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

JOY, BARNARD, Assistant to the Director, Research Program, Development and Evaluation, 305E U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C. 20250.

KAISER, DALE E., Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, 322 Wham Building, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois 62901.

KAMPSCHROEDER, FAY, Director, School Finance, State Department of Public Instruction, State Capitol Building, Topeka, Kansas 66601.

KAMPSCHROEDER, W. C., Assistant State Superintendent, State Department of Public Instruction, State Capitol Building, Topeka, Kansas 66601.

KARSH, NORMAN, Assistant Commissioner for Administration, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

KIMMEL, ALBERT, Controller, Board of Education, 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

KINGSTON, ALAN W., Assistant Superintendent, State Aids and Statistical Services, State Department of Public Instruction, State Capitol, Madison, Wisconsin 53702.

KLEINMANN, JACK, Assistant Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

KOENIG, ADOLPH J., Specialist, State Education Agency, School Finance, Office of Education, Room 3G012, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

LACKNER, JOHN T., Deputy Superintendent, St. Paul Public Schools, 628 City Hall, St. Paul, Minnesota 55106.

LAMBERT, SAM M., Assistant Executive Secretary for Information Services, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

LANDRY, JEROME R., Director of Research, Massachusetts Teachers Association, 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

LANGSTON, LaMOINE, Chairman, Administrative Services, State Department of Education, Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

LAW, REUBEN D., Assistant Superintendent, Costa Mesa Union School District, 1857 Placentia Avenue, Costa Mesa, California 92627.

LAYTON, GEORGE L., Director, Administration and Finance, State Department of Education, Montgomery, Alabama 36104.

LINDMAN, ERICK, Professor of Educational Administration, School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, California 90024.

LINDSEY, ROBERT G., Superintendent of Schools, Brooke County, Wellsburg, West Virginia 26070.

LOCKHART, JOHN R., State and Federal Relations, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

LOKKEN, HARRY, Research Consultant, State Department of Education, 420 Centennial Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55101.

LUMLEY, JOHN M., Director, Federal Relations Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

McCANN, LLOYD E., Professor of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721.

McCARTY, DARYL J., Assistant Secretary and Director of Research, Utah Education Association, 312 East South Temple, Box 2159, Salt Lake City, Utah 84110.

McCASKILL, J. L., Assistant Executive Secretary, State and Federal Relations, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

McCOY, JOHN A., Executive Director, Research and Special Services, West Virginia Education Association, 1558 Quarrier Street, Charleston, West Virginia 25311.

McGINNISS, DOROTHY A., Executive Secretary, American Association of School Librarians, 50 E. Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois 60611.

McGUINESS, LEWIS J., Acting Chief of Programs Branch, Division of Program Operations, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

McLOONE, EUGENE P., Senior Staff Scientist, The George Washington University, Room 214, 1145 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

McLURE, WILLIAM P., Professor of Educational Administration and Supervision, Education Building, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois 61803.

McWHERTER, E. M., Research Assistant, Illinois Education Association, 100 E. Edwards Street, Springfield, Illinois 62704.

MATZNER, G. C., Professor of Education, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois 61920.

MEAD, CLYDE F., Professor of Education, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois 61455.

MEYER, ROBERT E., Assistant Superintendent of Schools, 1200 Maine Street, Quincy, Illinois 62301.

MIKKELSEN, E. C., Director of Research, South Dakota Education Association, 411 E. Capitol Street, Pierre, South Dakota 57501.

MOORHEAD, JOSEPH, Coordinator of State and Federal Programs, Arlington County School Board, 4751 N. 25th Street, Arlington, Virginia 22212.

MORPHET, E. L., Professor of Education, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720.

MORTON, CHARLES E., Treasurer, State Board of Education, Department of Education, Prudden Building, Lansing, Michigan 48933.

MOSKOWITZ, RONALD D., Associate Director, Education Commission of the States, The Compact for Education, Duke University, College Station, Durham, North Carolina 27708.

MOUSOLITE, PETER S., Acting Regional Representative, Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 433 West Van Buren, Room 712, Chicago, Illinois 60607.

MUSHKIN, SELMA J., Project Director, The Council of State Governments, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

MYERS, ROBERT J., Director of Research, Albuquerque Public Schools, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87106.

NORTHEY, THOMAS J., Research Assistant, Michigan Education Association, Box 673, East Lansing, Michigan 48824.

NUNN, WILLIAM B., Director of Research, Florida Education Association, 208 W. Pensacola Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

NYQUIST, EWALD B., Deputy Commissioner, The University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, Albany, New York 12224.

OCASEK, OLIVER, Ohio Senate, 7665 Gannett Road, Northfield, Ohio 44067.

ODE, SIGURD J., Assistant to the Commissioner, State Department of Education, 403 Centennial Office Building, St. Paul, Minnesota 55101.

PAGE, RAY, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State Department of Education, 302 State Office Building, Springfield, Illinois 62706.

PARSONS, JOHN M., Director, Division of School Finance, Ohio Department of Education, State Office Building, 65 South Front Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

PECONGA, ROBERT E., Assistant Director of Research, Indiana State Teachers Association, 150 West Market Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

PETERS, RAYMOND, Director of Finance, The Board of Public Education, 341 S. Bellefield Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

POE, WILLIAM, Board Vice-Chairman, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

POLLEY, JOHN W., Director of Educational Finance, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201.

PORTER, MARVIN L., 1709 Flynwood Drive, Charlotte, North Carolina 28205.

PURDY, RALPH D., Project Director, School District Organization, Ohio Department of Education, 34 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

PYLES, THOMAS W., Director, State Department of Education, 301 W. Preston Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

RALL, C. E., Assistant Director of Finance, State Department of Education, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601.

RATHJEN, GEORGE, Financial Research Director, Arizona Education Association, 2102 W. Indian School Road, Phoenix, Arizona 85015.

REED, ROBERT, Director of Research, Minnesota Education Association, 41 Sherburne Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota 55103.

REYNOLDS, JAMES W., Professor and Consultant in Junior College Education, College of Education, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas 78712.

RIDDLE, HARRY, Director, Information and Research Division, South Carolina Education Association, 1510 Gervais Street, Columbia, South Carolina 29201.

RIDEOUT, E. BROCK, Associate Professor of Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 344 Bloor Street, West, Toronto 4, Canada.

RINGERS, JOSEPH, JR., Assistant Superintendent for Finance and Business, Arlington County School Board, 4751 N. 25th Street, Arlington, Virginia 22210.

ROBERTS, JOHN A., Education Reporter, News-Journal Company, 831 Orange Street, Wilmington, Delaware 19801.

ROBERTS, JOHN C., Professor of Education, Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois 61455.

ROBINSON, GLEN, Associate Director, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

ROBINSON, WILLIAM, Salary Consultant, Professional Development and Welfare, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

RODGERS, JAMES G., Executive Secretary, ACTA, 127-E Jefferson, N.E., Albuquerque, New Mexico.

ROSSMILLER, RICHARD A., Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin, 502 State Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.

RUGGIERI, JOSEPH, Superintendent, 1015 Amboy Avenue, Fords, New Jersey 08863.

SACKS, SEYMOUR, Professor of Economics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

SANCHEZ, RAMON F., Administrative Assistant, National Committee for Support of the Public Schools, 1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

SANDERS, EDWARD, Director, Division of Student Financial Aid, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202.

SAUNDERS, ROBERT L., President, Alabama Education Association, 450 Cary Drive, Auburn, Alabama 36830.

SEIDEL, PAUL E., Director, School Finance, State Department of Education, State Capitol, Lincoln, Nebraska 68509.

SELF, WILLIAM, Associate Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Charlotte, North Carolina 28202.

SHAMBERGER, MARVIN, Director of Research, Missouri State Teachers Association, Columbia, Missouri 65202.

SHAPIRO, NETTIE S., Research Associate, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SHAW, MIKE H., Assistant Executive Secretary, Field Services, South Dakota Education Association, 411 E. Capitol Street, Pierre, South Dakota 57501.

SHAW, PHILIP S., Federal Fiscal Administrator, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

SHAW, ROGER M., Professor of Secondary Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio 44240.

SPIGLER, FREDERICK H., Director of Special Services, Maryland State Teachers Association, 344 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201.

STAEHLE, JOHN F., Assistant Director for Policies and Procedures, Division of Program Operations, Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202.

STAFFORD, DAVID F., Director of Research, Pennsylvania State Education Association, 400 N. Third Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

STEWART, ROBERT C., Associate Dean, School of Education, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13210.

STICKELS, ROBERT, Assistant Controller, Board of Education, 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

STOCKTON, PETER, Research Assistant, Research Division, NEA, Washington, D.C. 20036.

STOCKTON, ROBERT W., School Finance Specialist, State Department of Public Instruction, Helena, Montana 59601.

STOLLAR, DEWEY H., Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Administration, Claxton Building, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee 37916.

STRAYER, GEORGE D., JR., Professor of Educational Administration, College of Education, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98105.

STROLLE, ROLAND S., Assistant Dean, School of Education, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001.

STUMPF, W. A., Professor of Education, Duke University, Box 6126, College Station, Durham, North Carolina 27708.

SWANSON, AUSTIN D., Associate Professor of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo, 120-A Foster Hall, 19 Library Circle, Buffalo, New York 14214.

TEDLOCK, RANDALL W., Director of Finance and Statistics, 100 East Capitol Avenue, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102.

THOMAS, J. ALAN, Assistant Professor, University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 5835 Kimbark Avenue, Chicago 37, Illinois.

THOMAS, MAURICE J., Professor of Education, University of Pittsburgh, 2817 Cathedral of Learning, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.

THORNBLAD, CARL E., Research Coordinator, The Research Council of the Great Cities Program for School Improvement, 5400 N. St. Louis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. 60625.

TIPTON, RAY A., Finance and Lay Relations, Florida Education Association, 208 W. Pensacola Street, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

TREMEN, RICHARD, Chairman of School Finance Committee, Des Moines Education Association, 944 42nd Street, Des Moines, Iowa 50312.

TURNER, LOYD L., 3717 Echo Trail, Fort Worth, Texas 76109.

VETRO, JAMES V., Senior Research Analyst, State Education Department, Albany, New York 12201.

WARNER, FRED S., Administrative Assistant, Budget Planning, Tacoma School District No. 10, P.O. Box 1357, Tacoma, Washington 98401.

WATLINGTON, MARIO A., Business Administrator, 12 Commandant Gade, Charlotte Amalie, Virgin Islands 00802.

WATTENBARGER, JAMES L., Director, Division of Community Junior Colleges, State Department of Education, Tallahassee, Florida 32304.

WELLS, KENNETH P., Executive Secretary, Iowa State Education Association, 4025 Tonawanda Drive, Des Moines, Iowa 50312.

WHALEY, CHARLES, Director of Research and Information, Kentucky Education Association, 2303 South Third Street, Louisville, Kentucky 40208.

WHIGHAM, E. L., Deputy Superintendent, Dade County Public Schools, 1410 NE 2nd Avenue, Miami, Florida 33132.

WHITLOCK, JAMES W., Associate Director, Division of Surveys and Field Services, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tennessee 37203.

WILKERSON, WILLIAM, Assistant to the President, Eastern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois 60115.

WILLIS, BENJAMIN C., General Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education, 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

WILLIS, CHARLES W., Superintendent of Schools, Hartford County, Belair, Maryland 21014.

WYATT, ROBERT H., Executive Secretary, Indiana State Teachers Association, 150 West Market Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

YATES, FRANK H., JR., Director of Research, State Department of Education, 125 Cordell Hull Building, Nashville, Tennessee 37219.

YORK, WAYNE, Executive Secretary, Idaho Education Association, Box 2638, 614 State Street, Boise, Idaho 83701.